The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXI • DECEMBER, 1946 • NUMBER 4

ARE WE ISOLATIONISTS?

THOMAS F. COULTON
Brooklyn College

THE admonition by Mildred Freburg Berry which appeared recently in this JOURNAL[1] called attention anew to a problem which has long troubled more than one mature and experienced teacher of speech. The problem came to a focus for Professor Berry upon her receipt of a questionnaire which posed, "What basic courses are considered essential in your teacher-training program?" Her answer was that of one who respects her profession and her discipline as a legitimate part of the formalized educational process and who hopes to achieve results somewhere approaching her ideals: The training of a teacher of speech must be built upon that broad base of subjects and interests to be found in the liberal arts and science program and to indulge in early specialization in this program is but to train the student in a craft.

It has been disconcerting to discover over many years that the undergraduate speech majors who are attending an advanced elective in argumentation often fail to measure up to the capabilities of mental discipline and growth possessed by the majors in such subjects as government, history, and economics attending the same course. And, to examine both sides of the coin, it has been equally disturbing to discover that the language and literature majors who join our electives in interpretation and acting, hoping thereby to gain some additional appreciation of the printed page, often come to us with a much deeper appreciation and understanding than that possessed by our own students. Have we by insisting upon too narrow a path of subjects in our own field cut our majors off from those other subjects which enrich and inform the undergraduate mind? Have we come too close to believing and acting upon the belief that an undergraduate student of speech might better acquire certain skills in radio techniques than gain an understanding of radio as a cultural and social tool? Are we prone to prefer a course in interpretation to the exclusion of a course in psychology or philosophy? Are we encouraging that early specialization which graduate medical and technical schools are everywhere discouraging in the college level for future doctors, engineers, and lawyers? Are we, indeed, by this early specialization attracting to the speech department the soft and the shallow-minded undergraduate as material for our teacher-training program?

[1] "The Modern Teacher of Speech is Obsolete," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXII (1946), 143-145.

I

There is no inclination on the part of those teachers of speech who have faced these problems to solve them by surrendering the ground we now hold to other departments. We are proud and jealous of the position we have gained both in the quantity and the quality of our departmental offerings. In a tense world, in a comparatively new society, in a culture still forming, with a language still subject to harsh regional pressures and in a period of rapid development in all phases of communication we are certain that we have much to offer to the average undergraduate and much to offer, too, to that undergraduate who intends to teach speech. We are also aware, however, that we shall have built on sand unless our departments can attract the best undergraduate material available and can offer it a program which is challenging and vital.

In those colleges where a system of functional majors has been set up, departments of speech are devising programs of study which dip heavily into the offerings of other departments and (this is of added interest) these other departments are making wider use in their functional major programs of the speech courses. A careful scrutiny of these speech courses has led to a weeding out of "technical" as opposed to "cultural" offerings. In the selection of the teaching staff there has been a greater weight placed upon preparation "off campus" and upon the breadth of that preparation. The social and cultural values of undergraduate extracurricular activities have received recognition and encouragement through the adoption of larger budgets, the release of teaching time for instructors directing these activities, and the crediting of these activities toward the participant's degree. Interdepartmental courses have been introduced. A course in applied logic — debate, argumentation, and group discussion — given jointly by an instructor of speech and an instructor of philosophy, one in play writing and production offered jointly by the departments of speech and of English, a course in radio script-writing and production similarly staffed, a course in voice science offered jointly by the departments of physics and of speech and making use of the facilities of each; these are cases in point. On some campuses in these days of a dearth of competent instructors and of expansion to meet our obligations to veterans, the teacher of speech has served in the department of psychology or has been called upon to assist in personnel guidance. The departmental organization becomes a helpful administrative device and not a straight jacket.

II

The Committee on College Plans of Columbia University has issued its report on "a program which shall be of the greatest possible service to the students of the future."[2] In that section of the report dealing with required courses in the liberal arts program — "all studies that contribute to the art of living, as distinct from the channeled preparation for making a living"[3] — the committee states:

> With the cooperation of the Department of English your Committee has studied the problems of the student in the use of the written and the spoken word, and the measures, both traditional and potential, for dealing with them.[4]

In an effort to clarify the nature of these problems the report offers this comment:

> Historically, the writing of the vernacular (or, in earlier years, of Latin, the scholarly vernacular) was an explicit, pervasive, and undisputed

[2] *A College Program in Action* (1946), p. 3.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

part of the scholar's general training. It was a specified subject of study under the name of rhetoric but it was the container and the medium of all intercourse in all subject matters, and its discipline was inseparable from any and every field of instruction.[5]

Thus the written word was the concern of every teacher as a partial measure of the student's aptitudes. It is still largely so in the universities and colleges of England and France. In America, however, the report declares, the place of "rhetoric" as a separate subject of instruction leading to a special proficiency was, by the middle of the nineteenth century, well established. This organization probably brought about a closer and more thorough attention to certain refinements for a fewer number of students, but "it is quite certain that the final effect of the plan was to delegate the sole responsibility for writing as a general discipline to a department, usually a department of 'English' or of 'composition' — which could not exert its influence effectually beyond the doors of its own classrooms."[6]

The regrettable results of this plan are spelled out: an unreasonable commitment, in that "writing is never less than a serious discipline reaching into the remotest recesses of academic effort,"[7] was made over to a single and, therefore, an incompetent agent which was incapable of performing the task assigned. Both the authority and the interest of other departments were curtailed. The average teacher of history or biology ceased to bring pressure to bear upon his students for careful, written English. The students themselves came to regard written English as an isolated and specialized skill not to be practiced in the writing of history or biology reports. Corrections in these other courses were not *ex cathedra* and were resented or questioned.

The solution is "to break down the feeling among students that composition is only a subject, and that it has no important connection with any other subject,"[8] and to enlist once more the interested cooperation of all teachers — beginning with those whose discipline would tend to make them responsive — and to set up such administrative policies as will help to achieve these ends:

> We recommend . . . that our administrative policy be used to give force to the requirement of careful and presentable writing by embodying it in the standards of every course given in the College, even to the extent of making it, in critical cases, the determinant of passing or failing.[9]

III

Though the report urges a change in practices upon the ground of special need in the United States and speaks of our problems as being "much more serious than it could be under any circumstances in a European country with a relatively homogeneous culture, no great diversity of language backgrounds, a sense of the integrity and dignity of the spoken tongue, and an efficient lower-school instruction in writing,"[10] it does not propose a program with respect to the "spoken tongue." Yet are not the historical developments and the present problems similar?

That "rhetoric" which included instruction in the spoken word in English colleges and universities and which pervaded the whole curriculum was, with its subject matter and methods, transplanted to American colleges and universities. Such departures as were undertaken were devised to serve the professional need of theologians for the training and instruction of whom the colonial institutions were established. One of

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.
[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.

these departures can be noted in the first college curriculum to be published in America as found in *New England's First Fruits*: added to the usual provisions of philosophy, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, Greek, oriental languages (Hebrew, Chaldean and Syrian) and rhetoric, were English composition and declamation.[11] This tendency toward the separation of instruction in the spoken word from all other departments continued into the postcolonial period. In 1806 John Quincy Adams accepted the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard shortly to be assisted by a "Teacher of Elocution." At Brown University a Department of Elocution had been established by 1830 and by that time, as disclosed in their catalogues, most of our colleges were offering specific instruction in "oratory" and had launched a program of "Forensic Disputations," "Declamations" and "exercises" at a set day and hour.

The further development of this "delegation of responsibility" is familiar. Beginning with the itinerant teacher, we are now arrived at a time when almost every college has upon its staff one or more teachers of speech. The founding and the statement of objectives of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH in Chicago, November, 1914, together with the wide realization of the ASSOCIATION's aims marked its last phase.

IV

The spoken word has come to be at many American colleges the responsibility of one group of teachers in one department or in one division of a department. Are we content with this state of affairs, or are we aware, as the Columbia report holds with respect to the teaching of the written word, that the commitment is unreasonable? Are we aware that speech, too, can never be "less than a serious discipline reaching into the remotest recesses of academic effort" and that the department of speech and the teacher of speech can never be competent so long as the aims of their instruction are loosed from the requirements of the general college discipline? To paraphrase the report, are we awakened to the fact that it is essential that we examine and restate the balance of relationships between speech departments or divisions and other departments or divisions of our colleges, that we must use powerful and insistent moral pressure to break down the feeling among students and colleagues that speech education is our responsibility alone?

It will not be an easy task to change the "attitudes and habitudes" induced by this "long divorcement." But a process of education — both for ourselves and our colleagues — can be begun. Interdepartmental committees should be established to maintain liaison and together make reconnaissance of areas of mutual responsibility. We should join with departments of hygiene, physical education and personnel service in meeting on a college-wide basis the problems of student health, manners, dress, and posture. Language departments, departments of history, government, philosophy, and others, where clarity of oral presentation is of great concern, should be invited to work out with us course content and method of mutual assistance. Our extra-curriculum program should be reoriented to become co-curricular and inter-departmental. Wherever and whenever faculties or faculty committees are engaged in an examination and a recasting of their curricula we must make an appeal for such administrative procedures as shall make of good American

[11] *Cyclopedia of Education*, ed. P. Monroe (1928), II, 59-63.

speech an integral part of the standards of every course given in the college, "even to the extent of making it, in critical cases, the determinant of passing or failing."

The antique notion of the oneness of the educational process must be revived if our profession is to survive. Isolationism should have no place in our educational thinking.

BERNARD LAMI'S *L'ART DE PARLER*: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

DOUGLAS EHNINGER
The George Washington University

WITHIN the past few years students of public speaking have evidenced a growing interest in Bernard Lami's *L'Art de Parler*. This remarkable treatise, usually referred to as the *Port Royal Rhetoric*, was without doubt one of the most popular and influential rhetorical works of the entire seventeenth century.

I

The treatise was first published anonymously at Paris by André Pralard in the year 1675.[1] At least seven subsequent editions, as well as a score of reprintings, came from the presses in rapid succession.[2] English, German, and Italian translations also appeared.[3]

For more than a hundred years *L'Art de Parler* exerted a considerable influence on rhetorical theory in England and America as well as in France. Fromant draws upon it heavily in his *Réflexions sur les Fondements de L'Art de Parler*.[4] Rollin is indebted to it for many of the doctrines set forth in his famous treatise on rhetorical education.[5] Rousseau recommended that it be studied by the young son of M. Dupin

[1] An earlier date for *L'Art de Parler*, 1670, is mentioned in two places: the biographical account of Lami in the *Biographie Universelle*, written by Mathieu Tabaraud, (2nd ed., XXIII, 91-92), and the article on Lami in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, signed "Th. Ruyssen," (XXI, 871). However, a careful examination of all of the evidence available lends considerable support to the belief that the article in *La Grande Encyclopédie* was copied in large part from the one in the *Biographie Universelle*.

Consequently, there appears to be only one original source—Tabaraud—which mentions a 1670 edition. On the other hand, there is a preponderance of evidence to show that Lami's work first appeared in 1675. The *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* and the *Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française Moderne* both give this date. The *Manuel du Libraire et De L'Amateur de Livres* and the *Trésor de Livres Rares et Précieux* list nothing earlier. The Bibliothèque Nationale possesses no copy issued before 1675, and the British Museum has none earlier than 1676.

[2] It should be noted that different editions of *L'Art de Parler* vary considerably in value. Later texts not only augment the princeps by a third, but give ample evidence of having undergone painstaking revision by the author. The most reliable of the early texts available in America is that published by the Elzevirs at Amsterdam in 1676. This, according to Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire et De L'Amateur de Livres* was set from the Pralard printing. A copy is in the Hamilton College Library. Representative of the more valuable later texts are the sixth edition of 1737, a copy of which is in the Northwestern University Library, and the seventh edition, dated "Leide, 1780" of which The Newberry Library has a copy.

[3] The first English translation was published at London in 1676. It was reprinted in 1696 and many times thereafter. The Italian translation, according to Brunet, was issued "à Lusques, 1758." For the German translation I can find no date.

[4] L'Abbe Fromant, *Réflexions sur les Fondements de LArt de Parler, pour Servir d'Eclaircissement et de Supplément à la Grammaire Générale et Raisonée* (Paris, 1769).

[5] Charles Rollin, *De la Manière d'Enseigner et d'Etudier les Belles-Lettres* (Paris, 1726-28).

in connection with his reading of *The Port Royal Logic*.[6] Blair's discussion of the nature and structure of language reveals many striking parallels with Lami's treatment of the subject.[7] Both Guthrie[8] and Thomas[9] have recently shown that *L'Art* in its English translations was widely used as a textbook in the colleges of colonial America. Witherspoon[10] mentions it under the title of "father Lami's rhetorique." Moreover, it has been pointed out that Dr. Samuel Johnson praised the work warmly.[11]

II

The factors accounting for such extensive and continued interest in *L'Art de Parler* are perhaps two in number. The first is its intimate relationship with the writings of that fascinating group of scholars and teachers, the recluses of Port Royal; and the second, its profound and essentially Aristotelian grasp of the fundamentals of rhetorical theory.

The second of these factors can best be discussed in terms of an explanatory analysis of the contents of the treatise itself, a task which will be undertaken in the third section of this paper. It may not be inappropriate at this point, however, to comment briefly on the first hypothesis.

Although written more than a decade after those justly famous works, the *Port Royal Logic*[12] and the *Port Royal Grammar*,[13] Lami's *L'Art* is in many ways so similar to them that it may well be looked upon as a sort of companion piece to these treatises. When the three are considered together, they furnish an exhaustive as well as a closely correlated treatment of the various parts of the art of reasoned discourse.

Fromant in his *Réflexions* goes so far as to say that Lami actually "composed the first part of *L'Art de Parler* from a part . . . of the general Grammar."[14] The close similarity between these two works in their treatments of the origins and functions of the different elements of language,[15] as well as the fashion in which they treat such specific matters as the distinction between the body and soul of a word,[16] and the figures of grammar[17] lends considerable weight to this supposition.

The *Logic*, it should be observed also, contains a highly condensed analysis of the parts of language which is based upon principles parallel to those found in the *Grammar* and *Rhetoric*.[18] Interestingly enough, however, there seems to be no striking similarity between the *Logic* and Lami's theory of invention.

It is undoubtedly because of these closely related treatments of common subject areas and also, perhaps, because

[6] Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Mémoire Présenté à M. Dupin pour l'Éducation de son Fils*. Quoted in Albert C. Gaudin, *The Educational Views of Charles Rollin* (1939), p. 109.

[7] Hugh Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (London, 1782). See Lectures VIII, IX, and the first part of X.

[8] Warren Guthrie, *The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America, 1635-1850* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: Northwestern University, 1940).

[9] Ota Thomas, "The Teaching of Rhetoric in the United States During the Classical Period of Education," *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, ed. William N. Brigance (1943), I, 193-210, 201.

[10] John Witherspoon, "Lectures on Eloquence," *The Works of the Rev. John Witherspoon* (2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1802), III, 505. See also his discussion of the various "external factors" which may influence a speaker's style, III, 534-36.

[11] So Guthrie states.

[12] Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, *The Port Royal Logic* (Paris, 1662).

[13] Claude Lancelot, *Grammaire Générale et Raisonée* (Paris, 1664).

[14] Fromant, *op. cit.*, Preface.

[15] See *L'Art de Parler*, I, 1, iii-iv, and I, 2, i-iv, and, of course, the whole of the *Grammar*. All references to *L'Art de Parler* are to the English translation of 1696. A copy is in the library of the Garret Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois.

[16] *L'Art de Parler*, I, 1, i; *Grammar*, II, 1.

[17] *L'Art de Parler*, I, 3, i; *Grammar*, II, 2.

[18] *L'Art de Parler*, I, 1, iii-iv, and I, 2, i-iv; *Logic*, I, 1-4.

of the dominant note of Cartesianism noticeable in all three works, that Lami's treatise is generally known as the *Port Royal Rhetoric*. In fact, it is at present difficult to explain this title on any other basis. The early French editions, for example, are merely called *L'Art de Parler*, and, so far as I know, the English translation of 1676 was the first printing to carry on its title page the statement that the work was written by "messieurs de Port Royal." Since there is no evidence available to show that Lami himself was ever a member of the Port Royal group, a tentative conclusion would be that the name *Port Royal Rhetoric* was added by some editor because of the similarities pointed out above, and that it was done either to stimulate the sale of the book, or as a result of the mistaken belief that it came from the pens of Arnauld and Nicole, the authors of the *Logic*, or from that of Lancelot, the author of the *Grammar*.[19]

III

The text of *L'Art de Parler* may conveniently be divided into two parts. The larger portion of it consists of discussions which relate to the following: (1) the physiological bases of speech, (2) functional grammar, (3) the science of poetic, (4) style, and (5) pronunciation. Appended to these discussions is a discourse on the art of persuasion.

The remainder of this paper will deal primarily with the treatise on persuasion, but before undertaking an analysis of that section, I should like to comment in passing on Lami's treatment of the subjects of style and pronunciation.

Style is defined as "the manner of expressing."[20] However, the essential thing to note, Lami says, is that different men have different styles because in the final analysis, the style of an individual is a reflection of his imagination, memory, and judgment.[21] If a person does not think clearly, if his imagination is limited, if his judgment is faulty, his writing and speaking will necessarily be confused, dull, and erratic. If, however, admirable qualities of mind are present, discourse will be clear, sparkling, and judicious.[22]

Thus, basically, what a man's style is depends upon what a man is. There are, nevertheless, certain "external factors" which also may influence the nature of an individual's discourse. These are two in number: (1) the age, climate, and general taste of the society in which a speaker lives, and (2) the kind of subject matter of which he treats. Even a great mind may be influenced by the prevailing standards of taste in its cultural milieu, and, as a result, fall into bad habits of expression. In addition, it is impossible to be magnificent or lofty when dealing with a mean subject, whereas, on the other hand, sublime material inspires sublimity in even an imperfect speaker.[23]

In an age when "the rhetoric of exornation" was still making itself felt, Lami insisted that the chief stylistic concern of an orator must always be clarity and comprehensibility. This quality is achieved, he says, primarily through care in the order and disposition of words. A "natural" word order is best, and should be departed from only occasionally, and then for the sole purpose of gaining striking and unusual effects.[24]

Lami's treatment of tropes and figures is most judicious. The necessity for employing tropes is explained on the basis

[19] Although Lancelot apparently wrote the *Grammar* alone, many of his ideas were derived from conversations with Arnauld and Nicole. See the article on Lancelot in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, XXI, 857.

[20] IV, 1, i.

[21] IV, 1, ii.

[22] IV, 1, iii.

[23] IV, 2, i.

[24] I, 3, ii.

of the fact that "no language is rich enough to supply us with terms capable of expressing all the different Faces upon which the same thing may be represented."[25] Hence, we must use words outside of their original significations in order to make our ideas clear and compelling.

Figures are said to be "Manners of Speaking, different and remote from the ways that are ordinary and natural; that is to say, quite other than what we use when speaking without passion."[26] They arise out of deep feeling, and are merely the ways in which we express ourselves when under the stress of emotion. Likewise they convey our feelings to our hearers. Since this is the case, we must, of course, see to it that our figures are "managed by just and honorable passions."[27]

On the subject of Pronunciation, Lami has this to say: In our thinking about rhetoric we must distinguish between the ideas and thoughts which form "the soul of discourse," and the words and expressions which are "the body of discourse." The "body of discourse" must be constructed in such a way that it not only meets all the requirements of good style, but must also be built with an eye to oral delivery. We must be sure that our sentences will be easy to deliver and that they will be pleasant to the ear of the listener.[28]

This double requirement may on the surface seem dishearteningly onerous. In reality, however, it is not so very difficult to meet because God makes all necessary things pleasant, and "this seasoning of Necessity with delight, is to be found in the Use of Speech. There is a strange sympathy between the Voice of those who speak, and the Ears of those who hear: Words that are spoken with pain, are offensive to the Hearer. . . . A Discourse cannot be pleasant to the Hearer, that is not easie to the Speaker . . ." and vice versa.[29] Therefore, if we choose our expressions with a view to the ease of their delivery, they will be sure to be agreeable to the ears of our listeners.

We now come to a consideration of the last section of *L'Art de Parler*, which bears the title, "A Discourse, in which is given an Idea of the Art of Perswasion."

This is the best known, and in many respects, the most admirable part of the entire work. I should warn, however, that it cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of the books which precede it. To attempt to treat it in isolation, as has sometimes been done, would be a serious error.

After pointing out that there is a difference between the art of speaking and the art of persuading, since "every man who speaks well, has not the secret of working upon the Affections, or working to his side, such as were before of a contrary opinion,"[30] Lami proceeds as follows:

> When a truth is eagerly contested, unless we be blinded with Interest, Perverseness, or Passion, good proof is sufficient to convince us; to remove all difficulties, and dispel all clouds.

[25] II, 1, i.
[26] II, 3, i.
[27] II, 4, iv.

Lami's scheme of classifying tropes and figures I have derived from an examination of the author's discussion of style:

Figurative Expressions have two main classes: "Most considerable" Tropes, and Figures. Tropes include Metonymia (Synecdoche and Antonomasia), Metaphor, Allegory, Hyperbole, Ironia, Catachnesis. Figures have two subdivisions, Figures of Rhetoric and Figures of Grammar. Among grammatical figures, Lami recognizes these: Exclamation, Doubt, Epanorthosis, Ellipsis, Aposiopesis, Paralipsis, Repetition, Pleonasmus, Synonymia, Hypotyposis, Distribution, Antithesis, Similitude, Comparison, Suspension, Prosopopeia, Sentence, Epiphonema, Interrogation, Apostrophe, Prolepsis and Hyperbole, Communication, Confession, Epitrope, and Pariphrasis.

[28] III, 1, i.
[29] III, 1, ii.
[30] P. 267. Since this part of the text is not divided into sections and paragraphs, references will be given to page.

but when the controversie is with people that are not fond of the truth; that are perverse in their inclinations, and prepossess'd by their passions. Reason is too weak, and we must make use of cunning. Upon this occasion two things are to be done; we must study their humours and inclinations to gain them: And because most men judging (according to their Passions) that their Friends were in the right, and their Enemies in the wrong, we must infuse such Motions into them as may bring them to our side: Wherefore the Masters of the Art have owned three ways of Persuading; Arguments, Manners, and Passions. They teach us that to persuade we must find proofs; we must deliver ourselves so as to work upon the inclinations of him we would gain, or excite such passion in his mind as may dispose him to our party.[31]

Logical arguments are discussed first. These are of two kinds: (1) the associating of an unclear or disputed idea with one that is clear or undisputed,[32] and (2) the use of a commonplace. Commonplaces are either Universal or Particular. Of the universal type, sixteen are listed: Genus, Difference, Definition, Enumeration, Etymologie, Conjugates, Similitude, Dissimilitude, Comparison, Opposition, Repugnance, Preceding Circumstances, Concomitant Circumstances, Following Circumstances, Effect, and Cause. Particular commonplaces, applicable either to *theses*—*i.e.*, "questions not determined by any circumstance of time, place or person—," or *hypotheses*—*i.e.*, questions "defined and circumstantiated—" are classed under the headings of Deliberative, Judicial, and Demonstrative. Those for the deliberative type are Useful, Advantageous, and Necessary; those for judicial speaking, Conjecture, Quality, and Definition; those for Demonstrative, Good and Bad.[33]

The discussion of Manners consists of an analysis of the qualities required in a person who would "gain upon an auditory." These are listed as Probity, Prudence, Civility, and Modesty. The constituents of Probity are Honesty, Virtue, Learning, and Wisdom. Prudence depends on Credibility. Elements of Civility are Friendship, Affection, and Tenderness; those of Modesty, Firmness and Generosity.[34]

A knowledge of how to move the passions is of the utmost importance to an orator for "men are not to be acted upon but by the motion of their passions: Every man is carried away by what he loves and follows that which gives him the most pleasure: For which reason there is no other natural way of prevailing upon men. . . ."[35]

In order to excite the passions, it is necessary to give the hearer "a lively sense and impression of the object of that passion wherewith we desire he should be moved."[36] This must, however, be more than a mere pointing out of that object. "We must display all the riches of our Eloquence to give him an ample and sensible delineation that may strike it home. . . ."[37] In doing this, figurative expressions are of great help, as is a thorough comprehension of the causes and characteristics of such passions as Admiration, Esteem, Contempt, and Laughter.[38]

[31] Pp. 268-69.

[32] This is merely Lami's way of explaining enthymematic reasoning. Note this example he gives in V, 1: "We argue when from one or two clear and evident propositions, we conclude the truth or falsity of a third Proposition that is obscure and disputable. As if to prove the innocence of *Milo* we should say thus: *It is lawful to repel force by force.* Milo, *in killing* Clodius, *did only repel force by force;* Ergo, Milo *did lawfully kill* Clodius."

[33] Pp. 271-279.

[34] Pp. 284-289.

[35] P. 300.

[36] P. 302.

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] See pp. 302-307. "Admiration" and "Esteem" are distinguished in this way: "Admiration is a motion of the Mind, that converts it upon some extraordinary Object, and inclines it to consider whether the said Object be good or bad, that we may either pursue or avoid it." (P. 303). Esteem results "when we observe anything good in the Object on which we look. . ." (P. 305). Thus Esteem and its opposite, Contempt, are dependent on Admiration, which is the first step in judgment.

The parts of a discourse are listed as Exordium, Narration, Proof, Refutation, and Epilogue. These are defined in the usual manner. Important in Proof are (1) the grounding of our arguments on clear principles, (2) the connecting of consequences with principles, and (3) the order in which they are used, which should be the "strongest in front . . . our best as Reserves."[39]

IV

In commenting on the "Discourse" it should perhaps be pointed out that forty-two of its fifty-eight pages are given over to a discussion of invention; twelve deal with disposition; and only four are concerned with elocution, memory, and pronunciation. The latter two, however, are treated extensively in the first section of the text. Memory is declared to be "a gift of Nature, not to be improved by anything but exercise; for which no precepts need to be given."[40] It is dismissed in a single paragraph.

As will be recognized, Lami's definition of persuasion is essentially Aristotelian in that it differentiates between the art of discovering "the means of persuasion," and the technique of applying them in actual attempts to influence. Not only is his analysis of invention conducted on the traditional three-fold basis of logical, ethical, and pathetic proof, but his list of "universal commonplaces" is distinctly related to Aristotle's catalogue of topics.[41] Furthermore, although the inventional concept of the association of a "clear" with an "unclear" idea may on the surface sound Cartesian, it is in reality only our old friend the enthymeme put into the dress of a somewhat different terminology.

On the other hand, Lami departs considerably from Aristotelian doctrine in his treatment of *ethos* and *pathos*. He thinks of ethical appeal as the assuming of certain "manners," a common way of interpreting this concept during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. *Pathos* he treats primarily as the process of implanting a wish or desire in the mind of the listener. In this respect he departs somewhat from contemporary practice, and allies himself more closely with our modern theories of motivation than with Aristotle's treatment of the subject.[42]

A curious fact about Lami's work is that after building half of his system of invention on the doctrine of commonplaces, he should spend an entire chapter[43] condemning them. However, this is what he does, calling them dangerous since they tend to make us lazy and induce us to refrain from searching to the bottom of a matter. Specifically, he says, "To persuade we need but one argument, if it be solid and strong. . . . All those feeble Arguments . . . deriv'd from common places are like ill weeds that choke the Corn."[44]

But it is the injection of good sense here and in numerous other places throughout the treatise that arouses our admiration, and causes us to return to it time and again as an example of the intelligent adaptation of classical rhetorical doctrine to the new and stimulating concepts of the nature of man and his world which were being evolved in the philosophy and science of the seventeenth century.

[39] Pp. 312-317.
[40] P. 323.
[41] *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (tr. by Lane Cooper, 1932), pp. 159-177.
[42] For a discussion of the various types of pathetic proof common in the rhetoric of Lami's time, see William P. Sandford, *English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828* (Columbus, 1938), pp. 70-97.
[43] I, 5.
[44] P. 281.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS: SPEAKER AND RHETORICIAN*

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF
University of Washington

JOHN Quincy Adams is barely mentioned in our books on the history and criticism of public address. Of the late nineteenth century writers, Sears,[1] Hardwicke,[2] and Mathews[3] do not mention him at all. Of more recent writers, Shaw merely names Adams as an important speaker, but makes no comment on either his speeches or rhetorical theories.[4] Platz refers in passing to one or two phases of Adams' speaking and mentions the excessive verbiage in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*.[5] Our sixth President is not among the twenty-nine distinguished speakers in the recently published *History and Criticism of American Public Address*; and, indeed, his work as rhetorician is mentioned only in a footnote.[6] Some of the anthologies, such as those compiled by Platz[7] and Brewer,[8] include two or three of Adams' better known demonstrative addresses; but the texts of his most important speeches remain buried in the *Congressional Globe* or in pamphlets long out of print.[9] In the main we must agree with the judgment pronounced by such neglect. The diplomatic and political achievements of John Quincy Adams have all but pushed into oblivion his rhetorical as well as his scientific and literary contributions to American life.

Nevertheless, his speaking on the platform, at the bar, and in the Congress played an important part in the first sixty years of our national life, from the founding of government under the Constitution until his death scarcely more than a dozen years before the Civil War. The texts of his speeches fill hundreds of pages of the records of Congress and many pamphlets. Two of the most important of his biographers have given major emphasis to his speaking,[10] and one of these has characterized him as the "Old Man Eloquent." The second Adams, moreover, was a student of rhetoric as well as an orator, a theorist and systematizer as well as a practitioner. In fact he is one of the few speakers of modern times who formulated a systematic rhetorical theory. His career is of some interest to students of public address, not only because of its dramatic qualities and historic values, but especially because it brings forward the problem of the relation between theory and practice in public speaking. To what extent were Ad-

* This paper is in part based on the author's earlier study, "John Quincy Adams' Theory and Practice of Public Speaking," *Archives of Speech*, Vol. I, September, 1936.

[1] Lorenzo Sears, *The History of Oratory*, Chicago, 1896.

[2] Henry Hardwicke, *History of Oratory and Orators*, 1896.

[3] William Mathews, *Oratory and Orators*, 12th ed., Chicago, 1896.

[4] Warren Choate Shaw, *History of American Oratory*, Indianapolis, 1928. See pp. 173, 174, 191.

[5] Mabel Platz, *The History of Public Speaking*, 1935. See pp. 219, 241, 254.

[6] *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, ed. W. N. Brigance, 2 vols., 1943. See Otis Thomas' essay, "The Teaching of Rhetoric in the United States," in Vol. I, especially p. 205 and fn. 2. We find some difficulty understanding why the rhetorics of Witherspoon, Channing, and Porter should be given some lines of comment, while J. Q. Adams' *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* are relegated to a footnote.

[7] *Anthology of Public Speeches*, ed. Mabel Platz, 1940.

[8] *World's Best Orations*, ed. D. J. Brewer, St. Louis, 1899

[9] For a list of these pamphlets and of other works by and about J. Q. Adams, see John W. Cronin and W. Harlev Wise, *A Bibliography of John Adams and John Quincy Adams*, Washington, D. C., 1935.

[10] John T. Morse, Jr., *John Quincy Adams*, 1898; and Bennett Champ Clark, *John Quincy Adams: Old Man Eloquent*, Boston, 1932.

ams' theory and practice consistent with or divergent from each other? We propose to review quickly the facts of his speaking career, to summarize his rhetorical theory, and then to lay the principles and practice side by side for comparison.

I

J. Q. Adams' career as a speaker began at his graduation from Harvard College in 1787. His commencement oration, "The Necessity of Public Faith to the Well-being of the Community," was a bold pronouncement against repudiation of public debts, and because of the financial difficulties of the new Federal Government it attracted considerable public interest.[11] During the next twenty years Adams made notable speeches on commemorative occasions, before the United States Supreme Court, and in the Senate of the United States where he represented Massachusetts from 1803 to 1808. His well known "Oration at Plymouth"[12] and most of his arguments at the bar[13] were spoken during this early period. In his Senate career he is remembered chiefly as the New England Federalist who defied party control to support Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana Territory and the embargo on foreign shipping. Some of his speeches on other subjects, however, especially that advocating expulsion of Senator John Smith of Ohio,[14] are more important for the student of speaking.

After 1809 Adams occupied diplomatic and executive positions in the Federal Government almost continuously until he retired from the Presidency in 1829, and his speaking was limited to a few addresses of the demonstrative type. Of these, the "Address at Washington," July 4, 1821, attracted greatest attention because of its scathing criticism of England, even at a time when, as Van Buren said, prejudice against England seemed to be a national sentiment in the United States.[15] Adams, it will be recalled, was Secretary of State, and his remarks were severely criticized in the press and even caused some comment on the part of foreign diplomats.[16]

The final and greatest period of J. Q. Adams' career as a speaker began in 1831 when he was elected to Congress. There until his death in 1848 he wielded the power of the spoken word in support of nationalism, in opposition to slavery, and in defense of constitutional rights, especially the right of petition. His biographers, John T. Morse and Bennett Champ Clark, have extolled adequately the courage and effectiveness of his efforts during those years.[17] He favored internal improvements, supported Jackson in the French controversy of 1832 to 1836, opposed the Compromise Act of 1833 and the whole doctrine of nullification, warned his countrymen of the impending struggle over slavery, and defeated almost single-handed the attempts of the powerful slavery bloc in

[11] This speech was printed in the *Columbian Magazine*, I (September, 1787), 625-628. See comments in J. Q. Adams' *Memoirs*, ed. C. F. Adams (Philadelphia, 1874-1877), I, 22; VI, 77; and in his *Writings*, ed. W. C. Ford (New York, 1913), I, 34-36; VII, 319-320.

[12] Delivered December 22, 1802.

[13] The most important cases in which Adams appeared were Head and Armory *vs.* Providence Insurance Co. (1804), Church *vs.* Hubbart (1804), Fletcher *vs.* Peck (1809), Hope Insurance Co. *vs.* Boardman (1809), and United States *vs.* Cinque and others (1841). Summaries of the arguments are in *United States Supreme Court Reports*, 2 Cranch 127, 2 Cranch 187, 6 Cranch 87, 5 Cranch 57, 13 Peters 518, for the respective cases in the order named.

[14] *Annals of Congress*, XVII, 228 ff.

[15] *Autobiography*. Report of the American Historical Association, 1918 (Washington, 1920), II, p. 494.

[16] See, for example, the anonymous, "Remarks of Servius Sulphitius on an Address by John Quincy Adams," reprinted from the *Alexandria Gazette* by John Shaw, Jr., Alexandria, 1822; W. J. Spooner's, "Review of the Address Delivered by Hon. John Quincy Adams at Washington, on 4th of July, 1821," Boston, 1821.

[17] *Op. cit.*

the House of Representatives to censure and expel him. His most noteworthy speeches were probably the arguments by which he defeated resolutions of censure in 1837[18] and again in 1842,[19] and his speech "On Indian Hostilities"[20] in 1836 in which he enunciated the doctrine of emancipation under martial law used by Abraham Lincoln in freeing the slaves twenty-seven years later.[21]

During this final period of his life Adams did little campaign speaking; yet some of his addresses, such as those to his constituents at Braintree, Massachusetts, on September 17, 1842,[22] and October 30, 1844,[23] were significant statements of his political views as well as red-hot blasts against his political enemies. The platform and occasional orations of this period, though numerous, have been neglected almost entirely by the biographers and critics. The published versions of most of these speeches are long and verbose, yet they constitute an open book of Adams' political and social philosophy and his intellectual interests. He spoke, for example, on astronomy, education, religion, temperance, the social compact, and the Constitution. The most important of these demonstrative addresses were probably "The Jubilee of the Constitution,"[24] "The Social Compact,"[25] "and the address at Cincinnati,[26] in addition to the well-known "Oration on Lafayette."[27]

John Quincy Adams cannot be placed in the select company of our greatest speakers, but as Justice Brewer said of him, "his orations and public speeches will be found to stand for a tradition of painstaking, scholastic finish hardly to be found elsewhere in American orations. . . . His speeches are important, historically, because they define political tendencies as a result of which the Whig party took the place of the Federalist."[28]

II

Near the close of the first period of his career as a speaker and while he was a member of the United States Senate, Adams was appointed Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University. Between sessions of the Senate from 1806 to 1809 he lectured on rhetoric once each week and presided over the student speaking exercises in Cambridge. His published *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*[29] constitute one of the earliest and most systematic American contributions to the theory of speaking. Adams himself said that he "should never, unless by some special favor of Heaven, accomplish any work of higher elevation or more extensive compass."[30] Edward Everett, who as a student listened to the lectures, said that they "formed an era in the University."[31]

The material which Adams presented was primarily classical both in content

[18] "Right of Slaves to Petition." *Appendix to the Congressional Globe*, Twenty-fourth Congress, Second Session, Vol. IV, Part 2, pp. 260-263.

[19] "Defense Against Censure." *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Congress, Second Session, Vol. XI, pp. 975-983; and *Congressional Globe*, XI, 205-208.

[20] *Appendix to Congressional Globe*, Twenty-fourth Congress, First Session, III, 447-451.

[21] See C. F. Adams' "John Quincy Adams and Emancipation under Martial Law," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, Second Series, XV, 436-478.

[22] Printed in *Niles Register*, LXIII, 135-140, 171-175, 189-191.

[23] *Ibid.*, LXXII, 155-159.

[24] Delivered before the New York Historical Society on April 30, 1839, the fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States.

[25] Delivered before the Franklin Lyceum at Providence, Rhode Island, on November 25, 1842.

[26] "An Oration Delivered before the Cincinnati Astronomical Association," November 10, 1843.

[27] Delivered before the Congress of the United States on December 31, 1834.

[28] Brewer, *op. cit.*, I, 64-65.

[29] 2 vols., Cambridge, 1810.

[30] *Memoirs*, II, 148.

[31] *Eulogy on the Life and Character of John Quincy Adams*, Boston, 1848.

and arrangement.[32] He drew his principles of speaking largely from three ancient writers—Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Of the entire course of 36 lectures, seven were introductory, nine dealt with invention, eight with disposition, 10 with style, one with memory and the final lecture with delivery. Adams' theory of invention was based on Aristotle's modes of proof—logical, ethical, and pathetic; and included some of Cicero's ideas on the topics or sources of material, and some of Quintilian's ideas on speech purposes. The concept of disposition or speech organization was in substance a repetition of Cicero's divisions of a speech—exordium, narration, proposition, proof, refutation, and conclusion. The treatment of style was based on Cicero's definition, "the application of proper words and sentences to the materials of invention," and included many precepts which were derived from ancient languages, and which, by Adams' own admission, were inapplicable to spoken English. Most of the remarks on delivery were culled from Quintilian.

Along with this classical foundation, however, the *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* contained some independent developments and showed some influences of the period in which they were given. Adams developed his own ideas about purity of style, figurative language, and pulpit speaking; and based his doctrines of court room speaking on his analysis of American law and judicial procedure. He ignored the work of the English elocutionists, Sherican, Steele, and Walker; and often disagreed with the English rhetoricians, Lawson, Campbell, and Blair. Moreover, Adams' emphases on deliberative and judicial eloquence and on speaking as an instrument of public service were in harmony with the growing spirit of democracy in America and with the new educational ideals of the time which emphasized preparation for citizenship rather than for the ministry and a few other professions.

[32] Rules of the Boylston Professorship required the lecturer to follow a prescribed classical pattern. Adams frequently mentioned this requirement. See the *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, I, 171, 178, 229, 397; and II, 139, 142; and Adams' *Writings*, III, 123-126; 148-149.

III

After these brief surveys of John Quincy Adams' work as a speaker and of his rhetorical theory, we may ask what relation existed between the theory and practice. Unfortunately we cannot assert that either was primarily influenced by the other. Adams so clearly based his lectures at Harvard on his reading of classical rhetoricians that we cannot say his principles grew directly out of his experience as a speaker. Nor can we assert that Adams deliberately applied to his speaking the principles discussed in his lectures. He may have done so, but there are few, if any, references in any of his speeches or in his *Memoirs* which reveal conscious use of his own rhetorical precepts.

We must recognize that in some respects there is not even a correspondence between Adams' theory and practice of speaking. For example, in congressional debate he showed himself a master of such special methods of refutation as exposing inconsistencies, *reductio ad absurdum*, turning the tables, and analyzing the meaning of terms.[33] Nowhere in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* do we find a reference to these methods. Again, we find Adams using chronological, logical, and topical methods of organization in his speeches; but no evidence has yet appeared that he ever theorized about these methods of speech or-

[33] This and all following statements about Adams' speech practice are based on specific analysis of speeches in the writer's earlier study, "John Quincy Adams' Theory and Practice of Public Speaking."

ganization. Furthermore, Adams used in his speeches such elements of style as restatement, negation, literary reference, ridicule, invective, and sarcasm. These were not mentioned in the *Lectures*. In fact, Adams discussed "elocution" or style more from the standpoint of the writer than the speaker, and recognized that only a few of his teachings on that subject were applicable to the speaker's task. Again, in some of his more bitter congressional debates, Adams appealed to anger and fear. His rhetorical theory opposed appeal to such emotions. In most of his demonstrative and occasional addresses Adams used appeals to religious sentiments. His rhetoric did not even mention them as means of proof. In Cambridge Adams appears to have been a theorist summarizing classical doctrines, in Congress and on the public platform he was a practical speaker seeking by every legitimate means to achieve his purpose.

Yet in broad outline as well as in the larger part of his detailed principles, Adams' theory and practice of speaking harmonized. As a young lecturer on rhetoric he had assigned to eloquence in a free country the high function of public service. His whole career, especially in the House of Representatives, was a thorough exemplification of that doctrine.

He told his students that moral principle was the "all-surrounding orb" in the make-up of a speaker. In his own speeches his character was probably the greatest source of power, for his courage won respect and his veracity and breadth of knowledge won confidence. To be convinced of this one has but to study the growth of his influence in the United States Senate, or to compare the records of attempts to censure him in the House of Representatives in 1837 and 1842 with the respectful attention and the ovations he received there in his declining years. Adams said that a speaker should have benevolence, modesty, confidence, self-command, and power to overcome obstacles. Benevolence he had, although it was often submerged beneath a cold and crusty surface. Modesty, too, was in his life, although as James Truslow Adams has acknowledged, it was overshadowed by a persistent integrity of self and lack of ability to think in terms of "we."[34] There can be little doubt that Adams' character possessed confidence, self-command, and the power of overcoming obstacles. His biographer, Bennett Champ Clark, has expressed doubt that "any other American then living would have had the ability, the self-abnegation, and the courage to make single handed the long, wearisome, and hazardous fight for the right of petition" which Adams made between 1836 and 1844.[35] He deliberately applied to his speeches his own precept that morals were more important for the orator then intellect or emotion. He said: "The merits of whatever compositions I have given to the world, either as a literary man or a politician, consist in the incessant reference . . . of all . . . argument to the standard of right and wrong."[36] Adams recognized the value of specific devices of ethical proof when he said that a speaker might explain his motives, profess his own virtues, recall his good deeds, disprove charges against himself, and praise his audience or express confidence in them. All of these methods he himself used, with one exception—in argumentative speeches he more often defied and challenged than conciliated or praised. Every fact of John Quincy

[34] *The Adams Family* (Boston, 1930), pp. 40, 95.

[35] *Op. cit.*, p. 292.

[36] *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, II, 202. See also Adams' *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, I, 355-357.

Adams' career as a speaker indicates utter carelessness of personal and political advantage. He spoke boldly what he thought, and therein lay one of the secrets of his strength.

In the use of logical proof Adams adhered to his own doctrine that deduction was the most conclusive form of reasoning. The basic logic of most of his argumentative speeches was deduction from principles, either moral, legal, or constitutional. To support these principles he often used the two forms of induction (generalization and analogy) which his rhetorical theory had defined, as well as the two traditional methods of refutation he discussed denying the facts and denying the conclusion.

For pathetic proof Adams appealed to deeply-rooted emotional attitudes such as honor, friendship, love of home, prosperity, and patriotism. These he had discussed with his students at Harvard. Throughout all his speeches the most frequent appeal was to patriotism.

Again, Adams taught that every word a speaker uttered should be aimed at a clearly defined purpose, which he called "state of the controversy." His own speeches seldom digressed from that principle, although they often involved complex purposes which grew out of complex problems and situations. He summarized for his students the ancient rhetoricians' topics or commonplaces of argument with the remark that they "cannot give but they may assist invention"; and in his own speeches he relied largely for his materials on three of those sources—precedents, documents, and testimony. He repeated the familiar precepts that the beginning of a speech should aim to secure good will toward the speaker, attention to his subject, or sympathy for his cause; and in his own speaking he used all three methods, most often drawing attention to the subject. He taught that a conclusion should "reap the harvest of the seed sown in the introduction," and at the close of his own speeches always returned to the fundamental theme, sometimes by summary or reply to opponents but most often by means of emotional appeal.

Adams' oral style, moreover, as far as it can be judged from the printed records, vindicated his theory. Except in some of the demonstrative speeches of his earlier years, the vocabulary was simple and direct. In demonstrative addresses his sentences often expressed emotion by means of inverted order and periodicity; whereas in lectures, court room arguments, and congressional speeches in which appeal was primarily to the understanding, regular sentence order and loose construction were the rule. The figurative language, except in some early speeches and a very few instances in later speeches, was congruous, appropriate, and effective. The general methods of development (climax, comparison and contrast, and accumulation), which Adams discussed in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, were the basis of his own oral style throughout his career.

In keeping with his rhetorical teaching, Adams always prepared his demonstrative addresses in writing, but seldom if ever wrote any of his forensic or deliberative speeches. These were prepared by careful study of evidence and by years of practice as a debater and of experience in public affairs. In early life our sixth President felt keenly his deficiency as an extempore speaker, and made three rules which reveal something about his manner of speech preparation. He resolved, first, to take part in debate only at its late stages, to make notes of the strongest points advanced by his opponents, and to organize these

before attempting to reply; second, to observe how the best speakers overcame the difficulties of extemporization; third, to understand every subject upon which he was to speak.[37] The records of his congressional arguments show that, although he always considered himself lacking in talent for extempore speaking,[38] he nevertheless became a ready and effective debater.

In the matter of delivery, John Quincy Adams' theory was not indicative of his practice. The *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* recommended a slow rate of speech, variety of tone, and sufficient loudness to reach the auditor; they briefly summarized Quintilian's precepts on gesture. No instructions were given for training the voice; oral practice was scarcely mentioned. Such evidence as we have from Adams' contemporaries indicates that, though his manner was animated and his articulation distinct, he did not always speak slowly nor with sufficient loudness and that his voice was shrill.[39] His most frequent gesture was a striking together of the hands. His appearance, though dignified, was stiff and awkward. Indeed his demeanor was described by some of his friends as cold and lacking "that nameless charm which . . . leads the soul captive." Nevertheless these limitations must have been overshadowed by his enthusiasm and dignity, by the factual basis of his arguments and his moral courage, for Adams' whole career as occasional speaker and lecturer was a succession of triumphs. In his later years especially he was deluged with requests to speak. The delivery of his more controversial speeches was characterized by unquenchable fire and enthusiasm, and with the passing years he won the highest respect for courage and sincerity.

[37] *Memoirs*, I, 332.

[38] *Ibid.*, X, 33-34; XI, 364; XII, 99.

[39] Typical comments on Adams' manner of speaking are to be found in the following sources: John Bigelow, *Retrospections of an Active Life* (1909), I, 53; William Greene, *Oration on John Quincy Adams* (Cincinnati, 1848), 21; Philip Hone, *Diary* (1927), I, 392; II, 526; Charles King, *Eulogy of John Quincy Adams* (Elizabethtown, New Jersey, 1848); S. Lane-Pool, *Life of Stratford Canning* (London, 1888), I, 308; W. Plumer, *Memorandum of Proceedings in the United States Senate, 1803-1807* (1923), pp. 445, 643; Ben Poore, *Reminiscences* (Philadelphia, 1886), I, 294; W. H. Seward, *Life and Public Services of John Quincy Adams* (Auburn, New York, 1849), pp. 219, 286; R. W. Thompson, *Recollections of Sixteen Presidents* (Indianapolis, 1896), pp. 153, 159; Martin Van Buren, *Autobiography* (Washington, 1920), pp. 271, 272; G. Waterston, "Letters from Washington," *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, VI, 519-520; J. Wentworth, *Congressional Reminiscences* (Chicago, 1882), pp. 12-13; *Niles Weekly Register*, XXVIII, 19-20; *National Intelligencer*, February 15, 1842; June 11, 1842; December 29, 1842.

IV

We have reviewed sketchily some of the leading features of John Quincy Adams' rhetorical theory and career as a speaker; and have pointed out that although his theory and practice differed from each other in some respects they harmonized with each other in the main. To resort now to a popular phrase we might ask, "So what?" In answer, three things: First, Adams contributed to American public speaking an organized summary and adaptation of classical rhetoric which, though overshadowed by the elocutionary tradition, holds a significant place in the history of American speech education. Second, Adams' oratory, contrary to the impression created by some of his early occasional addresses, exemplified an eloquence, not of ornate style and polished delivery, but of information and moral courage dedicated to the public service. His speeches were significant because they opposed the philosophies of states' rights and Jacksonian democracy, defended constitutional rights, and served to bring the slavery issue into focus in national affairs. The "Old Man Eloquent" wrote at least an interesting and instructive chapter, if not a great chapter, in the history of American public speaking.

MISSISSIPPI'S GREAT WHITE CHIEF: THE SPEAKING OF JAMES K. VARDAMAN IN THE MISSISSIPPI GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1903

EUGENE E. WHITE
Louisiana State University

MOST newspaper readers in America are familiar with the vitriolic anti-Negro agitations of the senator from Mississippi, Theodore Gilmore Bilbo. Only a few, however, aside from professional historians and a scattering of elderly Mississippians, still remember Bilbo's colorful prototype of the preceding generation—James Kimble Vardaman.[1] Like Bilbo, Vardaman in his time was regarded with repugnance by some northern critics, who went so far as to characterize him as an "accident of the times—a fragment of red-hot lava belched from a hitherto quiescent volcano of race hatred."[2] Such criticism had little dampening effect on Vardaman's appeal to white Mississippians, for they elected him to numerous state offices, including the governorship, and in 1913, sent him to the United States Senate. It was in the Senate that he aroused President Wilson's ire by his activities as a member of "hooks of steel."[3] His tall, impressive frame, his bronze skin, and sensitive, aggressive features made him a handsome the "little group of willful men" who opposed America's preparation for war.

Unlike the somewhat drab Bilbo, Vardaman had a personal magnetism that "grappled" his followers to him with man. Not content to rely solely upon his natural gifts, however, Vardaman resorted to spectacular extremes. Like a Roman senator, he wore his long black hair swept straight back from his forehead and let it flow down over the collar of his coat to settle upon his shoulders.[4] Clad completely in immaculate white, from shoes to hat, except for a black tie, he would ride through the streets of Mississippi towns in a giant eight-wheeled lumber wagon, drawn by ninety or even a hundred white oxen.[5] From the platform he would boast of his "humble parentage" and proclaim proudly that his first audiences had been "barnyard inhabitants and jackasses."[6]

I

Vardaman's first major political triumph was his successful gubernatorial campaign of 1903. There still remained

[1] Vardaman was born on July 26, 1861, in Jackson County, Texas. Seven years later the Vardaman family moved to the parents' home state of Mississippi. James attended school in Yalobusha County, and later studied law in a law firm at Carrollton, Mississippi. He was admitted to the bar in 1882. The next year Vardaman became editor of the Winona *Advance;* in 1890 he took over the editorship of the Greenwood *Enterprise;* and in 1896 he started the Greenwood *Commonwealth.* Vardaman was a member of the Mississippi House of Representatives in the sessions of 1890, 1892, and 1894. During the last term he served as Speaker of the House. He was governor of Mississippi, 1904-1908, and was a United States Senator from Mississippi, 1913-1919. In the Senate Vardaman was a member of the "little group of willful men" who filibustered against the Armed Neutrality Bill, and who voted against war with Germany. (*Dictionary of American Biography,* XIX, 221-222.)

[2] Gerrard Harris, "A Defence of Governor Vardaman," *Harper's Weekly,* XLIX (1905), 236.

[3] *Jackson Daily News,* June 26, 1930.

[4] Personal interview with Dr. D. F. Wilkinson, The Plains, Louisiana, December 1, 1943. See "Notes From the Capitol," *The Nation,* CIV (1917), 438. There are a number of plausible explanations for Vardaman's wearing his hair long. One theory is that he wished to hide some ugly wens on the back of his neck. Another is that he wanted to cover a scar from a wound suffered in the Spanish-American War. I found no record of any such injury.

[5] New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* July 11, July 12, 1911.

[6] *Dictionary of American Biography,* XIX, 221.

in the South at the turn of the century an unsolved race problem resulting from the enfranchisement of the freed Negro more than 30 years earlier. So acute was this problem that the news of President Theodore Roosevelt's entertainment of Booker T. Washington at the White House on October 16, 1901 and of his appointment of Negroes to federal positions in the South proved sufficient to touch off an explosion. To many Negroes, the President seemed to be offering new horizons of emancipation. But to many white Mississippians, Roosevelt's policies of racial equality were "acts of madness," striking at the "very citadel" of the white man's civilization.[7]

At this time Mississippi had the largest agricultural element of any state in the Union in proportion to its population. The great majority of these farmers were poor whites, who eked out a marginal existence from their small plots in the hills. Often they and the struggling Negro farmers came into direct competition for economic survival; they bitterly resented the success of some of the thrifty Negroes, and the more or less equal opportunity for schooling which some of the Negro children received.[8] Since the days of the Ku Klux Klan it had been these people, more than the aristocratic planters of the rich delta districts or the business and professional people of the cities, who had exhibited animosity toward the black race.[9] Vardaman conceived in these factors the opportunity to emulate Pitchfork Ben Tillman of South Carolina, in playing the role of an "awakening apostle" to the poor whites. With sentiment against the Negro perhaps more intense than at any other time since the Reconstruction, and with the poor whites having their first genuine opportunity to vote under a new state primaries law,[10] Vardaman's rise as an antiracial agitator in Mississippi was a simple matter.

II

During the July heat of 1902, more than a year before the election, Vardaman began to move among the people of the hills, augmenting racial antagonism. In speeches of the most incendiary nature he denounced Roosevelt as a "coon-flavored," "bronco-busting," "miscegenationist"; thundered at the "monstrous folly of filling the head of the nigger" with a lot of useless learning; demanded a prompt repeal of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments; and at times even advocated the use of the lyncher's noose for recalcitrant Negroes. "I am in favor of mob law," he shouted, "I would lead the mob to string the brute up, and I haven't much respect for the white man who wouldn't."[11] He promised that if he should be elected governor he would amend the state Constitution so that the funds then being expended upon Negro education could be transferred to the hill counties for white schools, leaving the Negro to secure only such education as could be financed by taxes paid in by Negroes. Vehemently he relegated the black race to a continued existence as menials, and predicted that unless he won the gubernatorial election, the Negroes would attempt to force social equality, and mass lynchings would be necessary to keep them in their "proper place."

By February of the next year three other ambitious politicians had announc-

[7] New Orleans *Times Democrat*, June 27, 1903.

[8] John Meclin, "Vardamanism," *The Independent*, LXXI (1911), 461-463.

[9] William A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic* (New York, 1907), p. 213.

[10] The state primaries law passed by the Mississippi Legislature in 1902 took the electoral power away from the political convention and placed it with the white voters of the state. See Edmund F. Noel, "Mississippi's Primary Election Laws," *Mississippi Historical Society*, VIII, 239-245.

[11] *Okolona Sun*, July 30, 1903.

ed their candidacy for the governorship. They were Edmund F. Noel, an aggressive State Senator and lawyer from Holmes County; Judge Frank A. Critz, a former District Chancellor and State Legislator from Clay County; and Andrew F. Fox, one of Mississippi's Representatives in Congress from Holmes County. Each was a worthy competitor against Vardaman; each pledged himself to support white supremacy, but denounced as demagogic and unconstitutional Vardaman's plan to curtail all Negro education. It was thus Vardaman against the field.

As the campaign dragged on through the late spring and summer, the four candidates traversed the state, delivering their stock arguments. In his speeches, Vardaman consistently side-stepped the issue of constitutionality of his plan for Negro education. He reiterated again and again that education was resulting in the mental and moral degeneration of the Negro. Education was turning him to crime; it was qualifying him to vote; it was instilling in him ambitions for social equality.[12] Only by curtailing Negro education could the impending racial crisis be forestalled. Grimly he warned his hearers that unless Mississippi elected him as governor and thus showed the Negroes that the whites were determined to resist the equalitarian policies of Roosevelt, the colored people would get out of hand, and Mississippi would have to lynch more Negroes in the ensuing 12 months than she had had to kill in the preceding 20 years.[13]

So intemperate became Vardaman's expressions that hundreds of Mississippians were stung into opposition to him. The *Biloxi Herald* condemned him as the most dangerous man ever to aspire to be governor of the state.[14] The Natchez *Daily Herald*, quoting the Springfield *Republican*, branded the whole campaign as marking the rise of a more intense Negrophobia on the part of the white race.[15] The *Meridian Press* stated that Vardaman's election would mean "four years of ignoring the law and of trampling the Constitution underfoot."[16] These and other articles prophesying the wholesale mistreatment of Negroes upon Vardaman's election terrified many black people.[17] However, the very fact that the Negroes were stirring apprehensively probably incited some Mississippians into a more violent advocacy of Vardamanism. One outspoken citizen of Washington County wrote to the Natchez *Daily Herald*, "I wish that every Southern man will spit squarely in Roosevelt's face . . . by voting for Mr. Vardaman for governor."[18] The McComb City *Journal* urged its readers to cast their ballots for Vardaman because "A VOTE FOR VARDAMAN IS A VOTE FOR WHITE SUPREMACY . . . a vote for the SAFETY OF THE HOME and the PROTECTION OF OUR WOMEN AND CHILDREN, and a vote for an ABLE, HONORABLE, CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN."[19]

When the polls were closed at sundown on the 26th of August, fifty-three thousand white suffragists, a majority of almost seven thousand, had endorsed the radical theories of James K. Vardaman. The New Orleans *Times Democrat* felt that Mississippi, in electing Vardaman, had warned the black race that a " 'nigger is a nigger' and President Roose-

[12] This line of reasoning ran through all of Vardaman's campaign addresses. See, for example, John Garner, "A Mississippian on Vardaman," *The Outlook*, LXXV (1903), 139.

[13] New Orleans *Times Democrat*, August 16, 1903.

[14] *Biloxi Herald*, in the Natchez *Daily Democrat*, June 16, 1903.

[15] Springfield *Republican* in the Natchez *Daily Herald*, August 20, 1903.

[16] Jackson *Weekly Clarion Ledger*, August 20, 1903.

[17] Natchez *Daily Herald*, August 25, 1903.

[18] *Ibid.*, August 26, 1903.

[19] McComb City *Journal* in the Greenwood *Commonwealth*, August 22, 1903.

velt and the whole Republican party can make him nothing more."[20] The Memphis *Commercial Appeal* argued that Vardaman's successful canvass meant merely that "Mississippi Democrats 'don't like a nigger, no how'" especially when they are incensed by "Roosevelt's coddling of the coon."[21]

III

Smoldering racial antagonism and the political awakening of the poor whites were the predisposing factors that made Vardaman's election on an anti-Negro platform possible, yet his personal magnetism and oratorical abilities were also immensely important. There was, indeed, something fascinating about his speaking. Thousands congregated at church festivals, county fairs, and basket-dinners to hear him, while his rivals were addressing mere hundreds. Even in Jackson, the anti-Vardaman stronghold, he attracted more auditors than did all the other candidates combined.[22]

So forcefully did Vardaman appeal to his hearers than even his opponents were forced to acknowledge his power of speech. The *Kosciusko Herald* said, "His bitterest enemies do not deny that he is an orator; to contend otherwise is to confess a fatuity of mind bordering upon imbecility."[23] In their attempts to describe his eloquence, Vardaman's supporters spared few superlatives. The Charleston *Democratic Herald* once stated, "James K. Vardaman has come and gone, and the matchless beauty of his rhetoric, the Gibraltar-like soundness and solidity of his logic and the fire of his Robespierrean oratory were heard last night by one of the largest gatherings seen in Charleston since the last hanging."[24] The editor of the Waynesboro *Beacon* could hardly contain himself after Vardaman delivered a campaign speech in his town.

> With matchless and overpowering eloquence; with an enthusiasm born of the subject nearest his great and loving heart; with an earnestness that emphasized each burning word as it fell like a brilliant dew drop from his manly and truthful lips . . . with a bosom that rose and fell at startling climaxes and masterful perorations; with an audience alternately laughing and crying, Honorable James K. Vardaman . . . held a crowd of 200 spell-bound for two hours and twenty minutes at the courthouse. . . .[25]

During the fourteen months of the campaign Vardaman rarely entered the Gulf counties or the rich, aristocratic delta counties. Instead, he directed his appeals chiefly to the poor whites of the piney woods area. Many times he endured a buggy ride of 20 miles or more over deep rutted country roads in order to address a crowded courtroom. His cross-country canvasses were a "remarkable exhibition of vigor and stamina." He was on his feet for 14 months, speaking at church festivals, barbecues, camp meetings, county fairs, and "political pow wows." He shook hands with "legions of men, bowed gracefully to noble women of the state," and "kissed carloads of babies." Between "button hole" conversations and baby kissing, Vardaman delivered over seven hundred formal addresses. With an average length of about 2 hours for each oration, this would mean that he spoke for 58 days, or almost 2 months, and uttered about ten million words.[26] As the Memphis *Commercial Appeal* expressed it, there was, indeed, "no sawdust in his constitution."[27] His tremendous energy enabled

[20] New Orleans *Times Democrat*, August 31, 1903.
[21] Memphis *Commercial Appeal*, August 29, 1903.
[22] Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, May 29, 1903.
[23] *Kosciusko Herald*, in the Greenwood *Commonwealth*, June 27, 1903.
[24] Charleston *Democratic Herald*, February 14, 1903.
[25] Waynesboro *Beacon*, in the Greenwood *Commonwealth*, January 24, 1903.
[26] Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, September 15, 1903.
[27] Memphis *Commercial Appeal*, January 26, 1904.

him partially to drown the opposition under an endless flood of refutation, counter-charges, and vituperation.

With the smooth poise of a master of the platform art, he exhorted, wheedled, and taunted his audiences. Sometimes, under the stress of recounting what he termed the evil effects of Negro education, he would stamp furiously up and down the rostrum, his long black hair flying loose, his swelling voice resounding in the farthest reaches of the crowd. There could be little doubt that Vardaman was a master of the sweeps and turns of the voice, the rhythm and harmony of apt expression, and the ability to reach out and captivate an audience.

Of far more importance, however, than mere skill in delivery was his interpretation of the prevailing attitudes of the people. Many Mississippians were convinced that Roosevelt was attempting to force social equality upon the South, and Vardaman capitalized the opportunity to harness the resultant forces of mass emotion and make the Negro the scape-goat for the white man's passions.[28]

Such is a critical historical analysis of the speaking of James K. Vardaman in the Mississippi gubernatorial campaign of 1903. He was a spellbinder and not a constructive builder; his basic premises were rooted in unstable mass prejudices and were deficient in logical proof.[29] But there are those today in Mississippi who yet remember his personal appeal, and the magnetism of his oratory. To them, he will always be Mississippi's Great White Chief.

[28] Harris, *op. cit.*, 236-238.

[29] George Osborn, *John Sharp Williams, Planter-Statesman of the Deep South* (Baton Rouge, 1944), p. 168.

THE "PRECEPTS OF KAGEMNI AND PTAH-HOTEP"

GILES WILKESON GRAY
Louisiana State University

IN the thinking of many of us the study and teaching of speech began with Corax, and in classical Greece reached its highest point with the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. Yet, if we consider the total length of time from the earliest known instance of speech instruction to the present, we shall find that Aristotle is somewhat closer to our own day than he was to the beginnings, for what is known as the "oldest manuscript in existence" contains the written version of a set of teachings regarding speech which date back to the early Egyptian dynasties. These instructions, which have been called the "Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep,"[1] are found on an ancient papyrus discovered just about one hundred years ago, and are now reposing in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The story of these "Precepts," their authors, and how they came down to us should be an interesting item in the history of our profession. Who were Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep? When did they live? What is the nature of the maxims commonly attributed to them,

[1] Cf. Andrew T. Weaver, Glen G. Eye, and Gladys L. Borchers, "What Speech Can Contribute to High School Education," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, XXIX, (November, 1945), 9-18.

and how were these maxims preserved to the present day?

I

In order to become properly oriented with regard to early Egyptian history, it is necessary to understand something of the chronology of the age, and the difficulty in establishing dates with a high degree of reliability. In general, two methods have been used by which dates are fixed; it is unnecessary to go into either in detail. One method, developed by Sir Flinders Petrie,[2] is to study the disintegration of certain early types of pottery. If the rate of disintegration is known, it should be possible, from the condition of a certain piece, to determine approximately when it was made. An inscription on such a fragment, therefore, would have been written during the dynasty in power at the time the vase was made.

A second method of computing dates is by comparing known historical events with astronomical and seasonal events, that is, with the movements of the stars an dthe inundation of the Nile. The particular star of greatest importance in these calculations was Sirius, or, as the Egyptians called it, Sothis. At certain times the latest rising of Sothis corresponded to the rising of the river; the calendar of 365 days was based upon the time of the annual flood. The Egyptians realized that the Sothic year was one quarter of a day longer than the calendar year, but the shift was so gradual that little inconvenience resulted.[3] During a lifetime of sixty years the shift amounted to only fifteen days. What they did not learn was that the Sothic year and the solar year did not coincide exactly.[4]

Gradually, as the years passed, the date of the inundation and that of the rising of Sothis became further and further apart, until, in the course of time, they again came into phase, so to speak.[5] This shift around the cycle is known to be 1460 Sothic or 1461 calendar years.[6] By comparing various events and the climatic or astronomical conditions known to occur as the same time, dates can in many instances be computed with reasonable accuracy. For example, the earliest fixed date, according to Breasted,[7] is 4236 B.C., at which time the Egyptian calendar was established. It was in this year that the rising of Sothis corresponded with the inundation of the Nile, an event which did not occur again until 2776 B.C.[7]

Upon the basis of these data, the dates of the Twelfth Dynasty have been definitely fixed as from 2000 to 1788 B.C.[8] No such certainty is possible, however, for events prior to the Twelfth. Especially "back of 2160 B.C. . . . our chronology of Egyptian history becomes unstable and exhibits a margin of uncertainty of at most two centuries; that is, a century either way."[9] Despite the uncertainty, however, it is possible to determine within rather wide limits the dates of the earlier dynasties. Thus, according to Breasted's estimates,[10] the beginnings of the dynasties occurred about 3400 B.C., the First and Second lasting until 2980 B.C. The Third ran only eighty years, from 2980 to 2900

[2] Cited by James Baikie, *A History of Egypt* (1929), I, 35-36.

[3] James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago, 1927), I, 27.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 25ff.

[6] James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Times: A History of the Early World* (2nd ed., Boston, 1935), pp. 58-59. Breasted is here correcting an earlier error in his estimates, by which he gives (*Ancient Records*, p. 30) the year 4241 B.C. as the earliest known date.

[7] Rather than 2781, as usually given, based on the earlier date for the establishment of the calendar.

[8] Breasted, *Ancient Records*, p. 12.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 40ff. It must be recognized that these are all approximations.

B.C., the Fourth from 2900 to 2750 B.C. and the Fifth from 2750 to 2625 B.C. These three, with the Twelfth, are the only dynasties with which we shall be concerned.

Sir Flinders Petrie, who developed his chronology upon the study of the disintegration of pottery, places these events much earlier.[11] The end of the Third Dynasty, according to his estimates, occurred about 3998 B.C., and Isôsi, last king but one of the Fifth Dynasty, reigned from 3580 to to 3536 B.C. He thus places the Third Dynasty about eleven hundred, and the Fifth about eight hundred, years earlier than Breasted. Griffith[12] seems to accept Petrie's dates, for he places the end of the Third Dynasty at about 4000 B.C. The *Cambridge Ancient History*,[13] on the other hand, places the dates of these dynasties approximately two centuries earlier than Breasted. Thus, the Third ran from 3200 to 3100, the Fourth to 2950 and the Fifth to about 2825 B.C. The end of the Twelfth, rather than the beginning, is placed at 2000 B.C. These dates, however, are not far outside Breasted's estimate of possible error.

It is impossible to say with finality which of these authorities is correct. But partly in the interests of conservatism, and partly because it would appear that Breasted's basis for calculation should be somewhat more reliable than that of Petrie, the dates used in this paper will be those of the former, unless otherwise indicated. Petrie's will sometimes be mentioned for comparison. There is no argument here that Breasted is finally and irrevocably correct; it has even been suggested that he may be one whole Sothic cycle, or 1460 years, in error. The deviations in chronology are mentioned as an indication of the difficulty of establishing early dates with exactitude, and also to avoid the seeming lack of agreement with those authorities who use other dates than those adopted for our present purpose.

[11] Cited by Battiscombe G. Gunn, *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Kegemni: The Oldest Books in the World* (1908), p. 24.

[12] Francis Llewellyn Griffith and Kate Bradbury Griffith, "Egyptian Literature," *Library of the World's Best Literature* (1897), IX, 5225-5344.

[13] (2nd ed., 1924), I, 173, 275, 281, 284.

II

In the year 1847, in Thebes, the eminent French Egyptologist, M. Prisse d'Avennes, bought from one of his *fellahin*, who had been assisting in the excavations, a well-preserved roll of papyrus.[14] This document, deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, is known as the Prisse Papyrus. It contains some 18 pages of writing in the hieratic characters. The first part of the roll has been torn off, but what remains consists of the sayings of two of the wise men of, even then, ancient Egypt. Only five sections, or paragraphs, of the first of these "books" remain; then follows a long, clear space which has apparently been erased. Finally appears another book of some 43 paragraphs which seems to be intact.

The papyrus itself dates from the Eleventh or Twelfth Dynasty,[15] but it "contains the only complete work of their [the Egyptian sages'] wisdom which has come down to us. . . . [It] contains the works of two classic writers, one of whom is assumed to have lived under the IIIrd and the other under the Vth Dynasty; its is not without reason, therefore, that it has been called 'the oldest book in the world'."[16]

Most of the literary texts that have come down to us are in a strange condition.[17] The inscriptions on the monu-

[14] Gunn, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[16] G. Maspero, *History of Egypt* (London, 1903), II, 228.

[17] Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 5228.

ments are relatively fixed, and except for the wear of the time and weather, have changed but little in the centuries since they were first cut into the stone. But it is quite otherwise with the papyrus writings. Fragments exist which date back to the early dynasties,[18] but apparently no complete manuscripts earlier than the Middle Kingdom (beginning with the Eleventh Dynasty, 2160-2000 B.C.) have been found.[19] It was during the Middle Kingdom that the literature of ancient Egypt showed great development.[20] Many significant papyri have survived from this period, the Prisse Papyrus being among them. It is probable that the earliest date that can be assigned to this document, on the basis of Breasted's chronology, is approximately 2160 B.C., though it is commonly thought to date only from the Twelfth Dynasty. Even in the earlier dynasties, however, the contents of the Prisse Papyrus "were probably circulating in written form, although the oldest manuscript of such lore which we possess dates from the Middle Kingdom."[21] As to the authenticity of the copies themselves, there seems to be no reason why they "should not be authentic composition of these wise old men,"[22] though, of course, these particular manuscripts were not written by them.

These manuscripts were, in many instances, merely copies of older works, some of which date far back into an unknown period. Often they were "the productions of schoolboys copying from dictation as an exercise in the writing school, and the blank edges of these papyri are often decorated with essays at executing the more difficult signs. The master of the school would seem not to have cared what nonsense was produced by the misunderstanding of his dictation, so long as the signs were well formed."[23] The exercises were essentially exercises in penmanship, rather than composition; the boys were learning to be scribes, accountants and clerks, and only a few ever attained to eminence in the original use of the language.[24]

Issue is taken with this point of view, however, by Moret, who considers these old writings more as textbooks in the modern sense. "At the Court there is now (in the XII Dynasty) a refined literary school which cultivates fine language and aims at a chaste style. . . . Anxiety to train up well-educated, right-thinking officials inspires the *Teachings* ascribed to Viziers of the Old Kingdom, Kagemni and Ptahhotep."[25]

In any case, while much ancient material was preserved after a fashion, by the time it had been copied and recopied for a thousand years or so, corruptions, grammatical blunders, omissions, and perversions were inevitable. "Only here and there is the text practically certain, and even then there are probably grammatical blunders in every copy."[26] In introducing his translation of the Prisse Papyrus specifically, Griffith has this to say:

> The language being difficult and the text in many places corrupt, it is useless to offer a complete translation. In the following, several passages are omitted altogether, and the most uncertain portions are italicized, and even of what remains very little can be guaranteed.[27]

[18] Breasted, *Ancient Records*, p. 5.

[19] Breasted, *Ancient Records*, pp. 5-8. According to Griffith (*op. cit.*, p. 5231), the Middle Kingdom extended from the IXth to the XVIIth Dynasty, or from 3000 to 1600 B.C. His chronology follows Petrie. Breasted's dates for the same period are 2445-1580 B.C.

[20] Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 5231.

[21] James Henry Breasted, *A History of Egypt* (2nd ed., 1910), pp. 108-109.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

[23] Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 5228.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 5228-5229.

[25] Alexandre Moret, *The Nile and Egyptian Civilization*, tr. M. R. Dobie (London, 1927), p. 458.

[26] Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 5223.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 5327.

Despite the difficulty of translation and the corruptness of the text, Egyptologists are in general agreement regarding the origins of these two books in the papyrus, and also in repects to the essence of the meanings of the maxims. There are some divergencies, which is to be expected; but the main trend of thought is reasonably consistent.

III

The five sections in the first part of the manuscript are attributed to a vizier of the Third Dynasty, about 2900 B.C., during the reign of Huni, or Heuni. There is some disagreement as to whether Huni was the last king of the Third Dynasty. According to some authorities, he was, and his successor, Seneferu (or Snefru, or Senforu) was the first of the Fourth.[28] Others place Seneferu at the end of the Third.[29] Actually, this king seems to have formed a link between the two dynasties, and in a sense, may be thought of as belonging to both.[30]

The point is probably of little importance; what is significant in the present study is the fact that it was during the reign of Huni that his vizier, whose name is unknown, "caused his sons and daughters to be summoned," when he had finished setting down his rules of conduct, and commanded that they obey the instructions he had written for them:

> Verily, all things that are in writing on this roll, obey them as I say (them); do not pass beyond what is commanded.[31]

One of his sons, apparently, was Kagemni, who later himself became vizier under Huni's successor, Sneferu:

> Then the majesty of King Huni moored his ship; then was set up the majesty of King Sneferu as the good King in this whole land. Then Kagemni was appointed governor of the royal city, and wazir.[32]

It would seem that the sons and daughters were delighted with the instructions, for

> They cast themselves on their bellies, and they read it, even at it was in writing. And it was better in their opinion than anything in this land unto its limits.[33]

Some interpreters have attributed the sayings to Kagemni himself; but since the death of Huni is mentioned in the "Instructions," and Kagemni did not receive his appointment as vizier until after the accession of Sneferu, it does not seem likely that he was the author. The "Precepts," then, were addressed *to* Kagemni, rather than authored *by* him.

IV

Of the five paragraphs that have come down to us, only the first and fourth have any reference to speech. It is, of course, impossible to say whether any of the lost portion of the book made further such references. But the significance of these short passages is unmistakable:

> 1. The cautious man flourisheth, the exact one is praised; the innermost chamber openeth unto the man of silence. Wide [*i.e.*, comfortable] is the seat of the man gentle of speech; but knives are prepared against one that forceth a path, that he advance not, save in due season.
>
> 4. If a man be lacking in good fellowship, no speech hath any influence over him. He is sour of face toward the glad-hearted that are kindly to him; he is a grief unto his mother and his friends; and all men (cry): "Let thy name be known; thou art silent in thy mouth when thou art addressed."[34]

The second paragraph of the "Instructions" warns against gluttony:

> Gluttony is an abomination; therein is the quality of a beast.

The third recommends governing one's own conduct by that of one's company:

> If thou sittest with a glutton, eat with him,

[28] Gunn, *op. cit.*, p. 24; Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 5329.

[29] Breasted, *Ancient Records*, p. 40; Baikie, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

[30] Baikie, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[31] Griffith's translation, *op. cit.*, p. 5328.

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Gunn's translation, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

[34] Gunn's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

then depart. . . . Refuse not meat when with a greedy man.

The fifth advises against haughtiness and stirring up of strife.

It cannot be said that the instructions regarding speech are very specific or complete. Possibly in the missing portions of the "Instructions" the unknown vizier may have had more to say.

The second section of the Prisse Papyrus (neglecting the blank portion) contains the oldest *complete* text of the writings of another ancient Egyptian sage. Small fragments of another copy exist, which "show considerable variation from the Prisse text, and prove the corruptness and uncertainty of the latter."[35] Although the manuscript itself, as has been said, dates only from the Twelfth Dynasty, like the "Instructions to Kagemni" it belongs in its original form to the Old Kingdom, specifically to the Fifth Dynasty (2750-2625 B.C.).[36] The setting is very similar to that for the older text; the aged vizier, complaining of the infirmities of his advanced years (he claims to be 110 years old at the time) and desirous of providing for his successor, asks and receives permission from the King to instruct his son in the wisdom of the past . . . "that sin may be banished from among persons of understanding, that thou may enlighten the lands.[37]

This old vizier was Ptah-hotep,[38] who held office under the reign of Isesi, last king but one of the Fifth Dynasty. According to Breasted,[39] Isesi ascended the throne about 2683, and ruled for 28 years, or until 2655 B.C.[40] On this basis, it is probably not far wrong to place Ptah-hotep somewhere near 2675 B.C., approximately twenty-three and a half centuries before the death of Aristotle. If, as he himself claims, he was 110 years old, he may have been born late in the Fourth Dynasty, and have lived through the reigns of all the seven kings of the Fifth who preceded Isesi. As Griffith points out, however,[41] "the figure [110] must not be taken too literally." Since he says that he was the "eldest son of the King," he was apparently descended from a former Pharoah. Baikie[42] suggests that his father may have been Neuserra, the second king before Isesi; but if he had been born in the first year of Neuserra's reign and wrote his "Instructions" in the last year of Isesi's, he would have been only 66 years old. All that we actually know is that he was, at the time he gave his instructions, a very old man, yet not senile, by any means.

One pictures Ptah-hotep as a canny, practical old gentleman, who has seen so many ups and downs in life, and come at last to the conclusion that honesty is the best policy, having tried the other way too, and found it wanting.[43]

This is hardly a characterization of senility.

V

Having received the permission of the King to instruct his son, Ptah-hotep begins:

Here begin the proverbs of fair speech, spoken by the Hereditary Chief, the Holy Father, Beloved of the God, the Eldest Son of the King, of his body, the Governor of his City, the Vezier, Ptah-Hotep, when instructing the ignorant in the knowledge of exactness in fair-speaking; the glory of him that obeyeth, the shame of him that trangresseth them.

[35] Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 5329.

[36] Baikie, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

[37] Gunn's translation, *op. cit.*, p. 42. All excepts from the "'Instructions" will be from Gunn, unless otherwise stated, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-61.

[38] His name is spelled variously: Ptah-hotep, Ptah-hetep, Ptahetep, Ptahhotpu, etc. The name of the king under whom he held office appears as Isesi, Isosi, Dedkere-Isesi, Assu, Assi, etc. *Ancient Records*, p. 40.

[39] Gunn, *op. cit.*, p. 24, following Petrie's chronology, gives Isesi's reign as 44 years, from 3580 to 3536 B.C., taking "about 3550 as the period of Ptah-hotep," about 33 centuries before Aristotle.

[40] *Op. cit.*, p. 5340.

[41] *Op. cit.*, p. 149.

[42] Baikie, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

Of the 43 paragraphs which follow, no fewer than 22 make reference, directly or indirectly, to some aspect of speech. Space permits only a summary of these; but perhaps a summary may be even clearer than quoting the "Instructions" in full, in bringing out the emphasis which Ptah-hotep placed on eloquence. The figures in parentheses correspond to the numbers of the paragraphs as they are usually indicated. Direct quotations will be identified.

(1) "Be not proud because thou art learned; but discourse with the ignorant man as with the sage," for no man ever reaches perfection. "Fair speech is more rare than the emerald that is found by slave maidens on the pebbles."

(2) If you meet a debater more capable than yourself, silence will be your best defense. "If he addresses thee as one ignorant of the matter, thine humbleness shall bear away his contentions." (3) Refute the false arguments of your equal in debate; you will thus appear wiser than he. (4) But if your opponent is weaker than you, do not scorn him; "Let him alone; then shall he confound himself. . . . it is shameful to confuse a mean mind." If you are tempted to ridicule, "overcome it as a thing rejected of princes."

(5) Be gracious in leadership, "that thine own conduct be without defect."

(7) If you are the guest of a superior, speak only when he addresses you, for you do not know what will offend him. 'Speak when he questioneth thee; so shall thy speech be good in his opinion."

(8) If you carry a message from one noble to another, be exact in the repetition; "give his message even as he hath said it." Avoid stirring up enmities by the perversion of truth; nor should you violate confidences; "it is abhorrent to the soul."

(13) If you are in the council chamber, follow the procedures as they have been set down for you. Avoid absences or tardiness. "Wide is the seat of one that hath made address. The council-chamber acteth by strict rule; and all its plans are in accordance with method."[44]

(17) If you are in a position of authority, listen graciously to complaints and supplications. Let the suppliant speak freely and without fear, in order that his injury may be removed, and 'that the thing for which he hath come to thee be done.". . . "a well-taught heart hearkeneth readily."[45]

(20) Avoid covetousness, for he that is covetous lacks persuasiveness in speech. "One hath remorse for even a little covetousness when his belly cooleth."

(23) "Repeat not extravagant speech, neither listen thereto; for it is the utterance of a belly heated by wrath. When such speech is repeated to thee, hearken not thereto, look to the ground! Speak not regarding it, that he that is before thee may know wisdom."

(24) In council with your superiors, if you would be wise, avoid speaking of that of which you know nothing. "Silence is more profitable than abundance of speech." If you speak in the presence of an expert, you may be deeply embarrassed. But (25) if you know what you are talking about, speak with authority, and avoid false modesty. "Make thyself to be honoured for knowledge and gentleness." Do not be silent; but do not be irritated by interruptions, nor reply heatedly.

(28) If you have occasion to render judgment, "speak thou without favouring one side. Let it not be said, 'His conduct is that of the nobles, favouring one side in his speech.' Turn thine aim toward exact judgments." (29) If you have done someone a favor, do not hasten to remind him of it the next time you meet him, if he seems to have forgotten it.

(33) If you would judge a friend's character, do not depend on the evaluations of others; seek him out at a mutually agreeable time, and hold discussions with him; "test his heart in an occasion of speech." Hear him to the end without interruption, if he wants to open his heart to you, and avoid seeming to be scornful, or withdrawing from him. He will thus give you the opportunity of passing a fair judgment.

(36) If you follow these instructions, your conduct will be above reproach; for "the quality of truth is among their excellences." Let them be remembered, for they are good. Let them be handed down forever; they "shall be made a pattern whereby princes shall speak well. They [my words] shall instruct a man how he shall speak, after he hath heard them; yea, he shall become as one skilful in obeying, excellent in speaking, after he hath heard them. Good fortune shall befall him, for he shall be

[44] One may easily infer from this statement that even in the Fifth Dynasty rules for parliamentary procedure had already been formulated.

[45] In this paragraph as in others, Ptah-hotep stresses the value of *listening*, which in many instances, he insists, is even more important than speaking. See also Paragraphs 2, 7, 13, 24, 38, 39, 41.

of the highest rank. He shall be gracious to the end of his life; he shall be contented always. His knowledge shall be his guide (?) into a place of security, wherein he shall prosper while on earth. The scholar [one who knows them] shall be content in his knowledge. As to the prince, in his turn, forsooth, his heart shall be happy, his tongue made straight. And [in these proverbs] his lips shall speak, his eyes shall see, and his ears shall hear, that which is profitable for his son, so that he deal justly, void of deceit."

(38) "Excellent in hearing, excellent in speaking, is every man that obeyeth what is noble; and the obedience of an obeyer is a noble thing. . . . It is a good thing indeed when a son obeyeth his father; and he [the father] that hath spoken hath great joy of it. Such a son shall be mild as a master, and he that heareth him shall obey him that hath spoken." (39) If a son govern his speech according to the instructions of his father, he will be wise, and his conduct seemly. (40) The fool, on the contrary, mistakes ignorance for knowledge, and evil for good. He considers idle chatter to be wisdom, and is shunned "because of his misfortunes."

(41) The son who heeds the teachings of his father will be honored in his old age. He will hand these precepts down to his children, and they in turn to theirs, "that they may be famous in their deeds. Let that which thou speakest implant true things and just in the life of thy children. . . . And such men as see these things shall say, 'Surely that man hath spoken to good purpose'." Nothing shall be added to, nor taken away from, these instructions. . . . Be cautious in your speech when talking to an authority; seek to create favorable opinion of those that listen to you. [But] if you speak as an authority yourself, "speak with exact (?) lips," that thy conduct may be seemly." (42) Whenever you speak, "Apply thine heart . . . to saying things such that the nobles who listen declare, 'How excellent is that which cometh out of his mouth'!"

VI

It is difficult to evaluate these precepts as a whole in the light of the ideals of ethics current in the Egypt of the Fifth Dynasty:

> Such a thing as an ideal is totally unknown either to the IIIrd Dynasty vizier, or to Ptah-hotep, unless it be that expressed in the familiar proverb, "Look after Number One." The sole principle which the two moralists recognize as the adequate motive for action is that of self-interest. . . . right action is recommended or wrong action avoided, not because of its rightness or wrongness, but solely for prudential reasons.

At the same time,

> . . . the impression left upon the mind by these scanty specimens of the thought and outlook of the Old Kingdom Egyptian is that, on the whole, if his practice was in any way accordant with his preaching, he ought to have been a fairly comfortable person to get on with. If in his company you need never expect to be led to great heights, or to have Pisgah sights of possible spiritual greatness, neither need you dread that your feet will be defiled with the mire of the depths. . . . "Be good, and you will be happy" is pretty much the highest wisdom of the Old Kingdom moralist, and goodness is not an end in itself, but only a means to the greater good of happiness.[46]

Ptah-hotep's philosophy

> . . . is of a naively worldly kind, inculcating proper reverence to superiors lest worse befall, and decent behavior to inferiors lest the anger of the gods be provoked. . . . This oldest proverbial philosophy of the world is naturally of extraordinary interest as a document for the history of mental development, and the Martin Tupper of 3000 B.C. is a very human old figure with his aches and pains and wise saws.[47]

Despite their naivete and their worldliness, occasionally a note on a higher spiritual level appears: "A well-taught heart hearkeneth readily;" "One hath remorse for even a little covetousness when his belly cooleth;" "Repeat not extravagant speech, neither listen thereto; for it is the utterance of a body heated by wrath;" "Let that which thou speakest implant true things and just in the life of thy children."

It seems unfair to evaluate the "Instructions" on the whole in the light of present-day standards of ethics and morality. After all, such ideals are the product of generations, even centuries, of induction. It was perhaps out of just such worldliness and naivete that our concepts of rightness and wrongness

[46] Baikie, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-204.
[47] *Cambridge Ancient History*, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

developed. In the "anxiety to train up well-educated, 'right-thinking officials" it is possible to observe definite strivings in the direction of a type of ethics that would not be based purely of self-interest. In the wisdom of these Egyptian sages can be seen at work the process of evolution in standards of man's relations to his fellowman. It would be strange indeed if forty-five centuries ago ideals of ethics should have reached a very high level.

As for those portions of the "Instructions" which relate to speech, Ptah-hotep seems to have jotted down the ideas as they came to him, without making any attempt to analyze them into basic principles; that process had to await the genius which was not to appear on the scene for more than two thousand years. But in the light of such a code of ethics as then existed, it is difficult to point out wherein he was wrong in his precepts. Perhaps his *reasons* for urging certain conduct may be open to some question on the basis of present-day morality; the conduct he recommends, however, in so far as it relates to speech, has for the most part stood the test of well over 4500 years.

Some years ago I fell into conversation with my old high school principal, whom I had not seen since my graduation. To his inquiry as to what I was doing, I replied that I was teaching—speech. It was with some disgust that he demanded, "Why don't you get into something established? Speech is just one of those new frills; it won't last any time!" What he did not know (and I didn't know then, myself) was that the "Instructions to Kagemni," which contain the earliest known teaching with respect to speech, have stood longer than the Pyramid of Khufu, and the "Instructions of Ptah-hotep" are almost as old.

THE IOWA UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE

ROBERT F. RAY
State University of Iowa

THE University of Iowa Student General Senate on the Foreign Policy of the United States was inaugurated on Friday and Saturday, March 16 and 17, 1945. The objectives which the conference sought to attain were three: First, to answer specifically the question: What should be the foreign policy of the United States as formulated in 1945? Second, to provide college and university students with opportunity for further research in the problem of America's international relations and policies and to provide experience in the task of formulating those policies. Third, to provide these students with additional opportunities in group discussion, parliamentary debate, and public speaking.

I

Planning for the conference began three months before its opening date. The more important ramifications of the topic, insofar as they could be determined, were ascertained and the subject was divided into ten subparts stated as issues of foreign policy. The issues were, on what seemed the most logical division at the time: (1) What should be America's policy in the postwar world

in regard to Germany? (2) in regard to Japan? (3) in regard to England? (4) in regard to Russia? (5) in regard to France and other "liberated" nations? (6) in regard to China and the Far East? (7) in regard to Latin America? (8) in regard to world government? (9) in regard to world economics? (10) in regard to world communications?

The questions determined by the Student Forensic Association and the faculty advisors were presented to students in public discussion and debate classes at the University of Iowa in January. Each selected that one which especially interested him. On this basis the students were organized into ten committees or discussion groups. A capable student chairman was assigned to each of the groups. Group and individual outlines were drawn and stress was placed on application of effective discussion techniques. This freedom of choice not only permitted the students to select questions in which they had strong interest, but it further narrowed the field of intensive research necessary in preparation for the conference. The problem of preparing students for the conference was thus eased at the outset. An intensive bibliography was prepared, library references were reserved, and otherwise research methods were facilitated.

Visiting student speakers, limited in number by travel conditions, were invited to select the fields they would concentrate upon, and the committees already established on the Iowa campus were enlarged or reduced so that no more than ten were on any committee when the conference began.

The plan arbitrarily to limit the phases to the more important aspects of the question assured the minimum of quibbling and at the same time allowed an opportunity for expression of a wide range of interests.

From the outset, emphasis was placed on solving the problem rather than in "winning or losing" a discussion. Significance of ideas and crystallization of student opinions through group reflective thinking were prime considerations.

II

Four main features of the two-day event included an opening session for organizational purposes; a series of committee meetings to analyze the problem; sessions to frame committee conclusions; and a final session of the senate to pass on the resolutions or reports submitted by each of the ten committees.

The following order of business marked the opening session: Call to order by the temporary chairman. Keynote speech of welcome by Professor Kirk Porter, Head of the Department of Political Science, State University of Iowa. Election of a temporary clerk. Roll call. Election of permanent chairman and clerk. Recess for committee deliberations. About one hundred delegates participated.

Group discussion was stressed, especially in the opening committee meetings. In view of the time limitations, how much of the two days should be devoted to committee discussion; or to state it differently, how much time should be given to definition of the problem, to the causes of the problem, and to solutions? The planning committee decided that the delegates should be as free as they themselves chose during the two-day period. Thus, if they were to agree on definitions in ten minutes, they could move immediately to the next phase of the problem. Flexibility was thus encouraged. The retention of the personnel of each committee lent continuity.

The first discussion period for each

committee was limited to two hours. The speaking in the groups centered on defining the subject, determining the cause of the problems involved in the special issue assigned to them, and analyzing the representative solutions.

Although emphasis was placed on problem-solving, critic judges were instructed to attend the sessions to appraise each participant on the well-known "below average, average, good, excellent, superior" basis. The ratings were translated into one-to-five number equivalents for tabulation. Two critics judged each session. (To secure full constructive criticism it is proposed that for future student senates the sheet be accompanied by duplicate carbon copies to be distributed to the participants.) The participants also rated each other and the average of their rating was placed in a column parallel to that of the critic. The correlation between the student and critic ratings was +.68, a correlation which may be considered substantial.

The second session for committees began in the afternoon. Each of the delegates at this meeting gave a five-minute uninterrupted talk presenting his individual solution on the basis of the possible ones determined by the group earlier. The other committeemen then were allowed to question the speaker for two minutes regarding his plan. Critic judges rated each on a scale similar to that used by the discussion critics.

The third and final committee session was limited to one and one-half hours, and followed Roberts' Rules for Committee Meetings. The groups prepared a set of resolutions embodying their solutions in the form of a United States Senate resolution. These sessions adjourned for dinner and those not yet prepared reconvened for as much of an additional hour as they required. Some of the committees prepared minority reports.

The final meeting was the Assembly. The delegates all assembled for final General Assembly meetings which were divided into three sessions. The first session began at 8:00 P.M., Friday, the first day. The chairman, responding to the roll call, read the majority reports of their committees. A calendar was thus formed. The clerk reread the resolutions in order, and as each was considered minority reports were allowed with other full parliamentary rights. A maximum of one hour was allowed for consideration of any one report. The evening session officially adjourned at 10:00 P.M. The second session began the following morning, and the third convened after a forensic luncheon.

In addition to these mean features of the conference, several radio broadcasts were scheduled, including committee deliberations, solution speeches, interviews, and an Assembly session.

III

A further explanation about the resolution should be given. Prior to the conference an attitude scale was prepared on the subject of American Foreign Policy. Six questions were prepared for each of the ten categories of the main topic. These queries were based on current importance, significance to American long-term policy, and on the goals set for the participants insofar as these factors could logically be determined. Typical of the questions and scales are these:

I favor a system of complete allied economic control of Germany in the postwar world: yes . . . no . . . undecided . . . don't know . . . .

The United States Senate should ratify in treaty form the Chapaultepec Agreement: yes . . . . no . . . undecided . . . don't know . . . .

I favor the Dumbarton Oaks Plan . . . . the Culbertson Plan . . . . no participation in a world organization of any kind . . . . a world federation

. . . a series of regional federations . . . a series of regional confederations. . . . no opinion. . . .

Fill in any proposal you may favor that is not listed above .....

One hundred students were given the questionnaire at registration to be returned before the conference began. Respondees were selected at random and told that they were to write their names on a first detachable sheet only so that the committee in charge could be certain each delegation was properly represented numerically. Each was cautioned to consider the seriousness of the questions and to act accordingly.

As a result of this test it was possible to compile a cross section of student opinion and to note the extent to which the majority opinions were tempered as ultimately revealed in the resolutions. While there exists no way of determining the exact amount of opinion shift in the sample when the group is mixed with the general population concerned, we were satisfied that the opinions of the individuals questioned were for the most part reflected in the resolutions drawn by the assembly. The test undoubtedly stimulated discussion, for it brought to sharp focus the questions around which the discussions and parliamentary debate centered.

No claim is made that this kind of practice results in an infallible measure of generally "representative student opinion." Undoubtedly these students were better read than a group representative of *all* college students. Nonetheless the concensus was probably of much interest to the forensics directors present in showing possible topics for discussion on which a majority opinion showed a close percentage difference from minority opinion. We had a clearer insight, at least, into what students who take part in such conferences, were thinking. The discussants were much interested in the results.[1]

IV

We hope that this student senate, although not unique in its various features, did accomplish definite goals:

1. It attempted to secure more concentrated and prolonged preparation on a limited discussion topic than is often done for such intercollegiate conferences.

2. It stressed realistic goals of formulating and expressing carefully reasoned opinions on the issues.

3. It encouraged also the general participation of the delegates as a whole in all phases of the problem (in addition to the experience of a more authoritative specialization or an assigned area).

4. It retained the features of criticism and rating of each individual and so permitted the competitive factor to be retained. (At the end of the conference the "superior" and "excellent" performers were announced.)

5. It retained the element of individual public speaking to supplement round table techniques.

6. It incorporated extended application of parliamentary law.

7. It required careful formulations of resolutions.

8. It gave somewhat full reflection, in the general sessions, of concrete resolutions.

9. It added to the usual record of such resolutions a comprehensive attitude compilation on the problems.

[1] Another attitude scale was compiled for the Conference on Problems of the Peace held at the University of Iowa, November 30-December 1, 1945, and a third for the participants in the Student Senate of the Iowa High School Forensic League at the University of Iowa, March 28, 29, 30, 1946. We are continuing to experiment in the belief that the quality of the resolutions adopted through progressive rounds of discussion as well as the discussion itself is improved as a result of such practice.

THE DOUBLE-SUMMARY TECHNIQUE IN DEBATE

G. M. MUSGRAVE
Des Moines

IN the last few years the double-summary technique in debate has been receiving increasing attention. It is not a new form of debate nor a new form of discussion; it is simply a new technique applied to competitive debate as we know it today.

In the first part of this article, the double-summary technique is discussed from the viewpoint of coach and debater as a means of presenting their ideas more effectively. In the second part, it is discussed from the point of view of the judge as a means of reaching his decision more accurately and objectively than he might be able to do without some such system.

Let it be understood that we are discussing only contest debate and that we are discussing only the proposition of policy, since national high school and college topics are worded in that manner. Naturally any single technique of analysis will not work equally well for all phases of speech activity. The analysis presented here is intended for the contest situation in which the proposition for debate is worded in the usual form.

Organizing the Case

Since the time of Baker, one type of case organization has dominated debate literature. Whether the reader consults textbooks, handbooks, or magazine articles, he usually finds something like this recommended:

I. The plan is necessary.
II. The plan is practical.

Or, another way of saying the same thing:

I. There is a need for a change.
II. How the plan will meet the need.

Debaters often recognize that this form in itself is inadequate and make the organization a little more specific:

I. Need for a change
  A. Need No. 1
  B. Need No. 2
  C. Need No. 3
II. How plan will meet need
  A. It will remedy Need No. 1
  B. It will remedy Need No. 2
  C. It will remedy Need No. 3.

Now while this organization is logical, it sometimes leads debaters into irrelevant material. Often the first affirmative speaker, in his glowing description of the bad state of present conditions, attempts to prove the existence of certain evils which this plan will not correct. Often the second affirmative speaker, in his encomiums on the proposed plan, attempts to show that the plan will correct certain conditions not shown to be bad by his colleague. Such discussion of irrelevant matters is sloppy thinking, of course, and no organization can hope to prevent the debater from doing sloppy thinking if that is all he is capable of doing.

There is, however, a form of organization which experience to date indicates is less likely to result in irrelevancies. It is this:

Affirmative

I. Advantage No. 1
  (of affirmative plan with respect to *status quo*)
  A. Statement of need
  B. How the plan will meet this need
II. Advantage No. 2
  A. Statement of need
  B. How the plan will meet this need
III. Advantage No. 3
  A. Statement of need
  B. How the plan will meet this need

Negative

I. Disadvantage No. 1
(of affirmative plan with respect to *status quo*)
A. Importance of the disadvantage
B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage

II. Disadvantage No. 2
A. Importance of the disadvantage
B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage

III. Disadvantage No. 3
A. Importance of the disadvantage
B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage.

In addition to the above arguments, both affirmative and negative teams attempt to refute the case of the opposition.

Thus, the affirmative asserts that the proposed plan should be adopted because it would bring about two or three specific advantages. The affirmative discusses each advantage in turn, showing its importance in terms of present conditions (the "need") and then illustrates how the proposed plan will bring it about.

If the negative chooses to defend the *status quo*, it denies that the plan will bring about these advantages, and asserts that on the contrary it will bring about certain disadvantages that more than outweigh any minor benefits the plan might bring.

If, on the other hand, the negative chooses to offer a counterplan, it admits each of the affirmative needs in turn showing in each case how the counterplan meets the admitted need (perhaps better than the affirmative plan), and how it meets other needs which the affirmative neglected to mention. The debate then becomes a contrasting of advantages and disadvantages of one solution with respect to the other.

In a counterplan debate, the case organization looks something like this:

Negative

I. Advantage No. 1
(of negative counterplan with respect to affirmative plan)
A. Statement of need
B. How the counterplan will meet this need

II. Advantage No. 2
A. Statement of need
B. How the counterplan will meet this need

III. Advantage No. 3
A. Statement of need
B. How the counterplan will meet this need.

Affirmative

Affirmative plan is better than *status quo* in at least one respect, plus:

I. Disadvantage No. 1
(of negative counterplan with respect to affirmative plan)
A. Importance of the disadvantage
B. How counterplan will produce this disadvantage

II. Disadvantage No. 2
A. Importance of the disadvantage
B. How counterplan will produce this disadvantage

III. Disadvantage No. 3
A. Importance of the disadvantage
B. How counterplan will produce this disadvantage.

In the above outlines, I have deliberately placed the negative before the affirmative, not because the speaking order is in any way altered, but because the negative has taken on the burden of proof. By comparing the outline for a debate in which the negative recommends retention of the *status quo* with the outline for a debate in which the negative recommends a counterplan, it will be seen that the outlines show marked similarities, differing only in the shift of the burden of proof. Of course, in the affirmative outline given above, it will not be possible for the affirmative to bring out the disadvantages of the negative counterplan until the second constructive speech, since the plan is still unknown at the time of the first constructive speech; the time will

not be wasted, however, for the first affirmative normally devotes his time to establishing at least one advantage of the affirmative plan with respect to the *status quo*, and this is needed for a complete case regardless of the stand taken by the negative.

Last year's high school topic may be used to illustrate the form the recommended organization takes when the negative defends the *status quo*. On the topic, "*Resolved*, that every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24," the affirmative may choose two or three (certainly not more) of the following advantages:

I. Would provide United States means to repel invasion
   A. Statement of need
   B. How affirmative plan will meet this need
II. Would provide United States means to stop foreign aggression at source.
   A. Statement of need
   B. How affirmative plan will meet this need
III. Would eliminate much racial, religious, and economic intolerance in this country
   A. Statement of need
   B. How affirmative plan will meet this need
IV. Would develop trade skills among the unskilled; literacy among the illiterate
   A. Statement of need
   B. How affirmative plan will meet this need
V. Would improve the physical health of the nation's youth.
   A. Statement of need
   B. How affirmative plan will meet this need.

The negative, on the other hand, may assert that the plan would bring about two or three of the following disadvantages:

I. Would encourage armament and military preparedness race among the nations of the world
   A. Importance of the disadvantage
   B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage
II. Would provoke war by providing nation leaders with military power, leading ultimately to acts of aggression abroad by the United States
   A. Importance of the disadvantage
   B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage
III. Would cause severe dislocation in certain businesses and industries, since no one is to be exempt if physically fit
   A. Importance of the disadvantage
   B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage
IV. Would cost a great deal, not only in money but in goods and services these men otherwise could be producing
   A. Importance of the disadvantage
   B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage
V. Would encourage lowered moral standards
   A. Importance of the disadvantage
   B. How affirmative plan will produce this disadvantage.

In using this plan of organization, the first affirmative speaker usually opens something like this:

> Ladies and gentlemen: We of the affirmative are proposing this evening that the federal government adopt a nationwide program of socialized medicine. We submit that the plan will have two major advantages, namely (1) the improvement in health standards of the nation, and (2) the reduction of unemployment in the next depression. Let us examine each of these advantages in turn, showing how important each is and how our plan will bring each about.

When using the double-summary form of organization, the rebuttalist on each side can keep track of the various arguments, their refutation and counter-refutation by means of double-summary sheets. The rebuttalist prepares two of these sheets, one for the affirmative case and one for the negative case. Turning a blank sheet of paper sideways and dividing it into columns, he lists the asserted advantages or disadvantages in the left hand column and the refutation and counter-refutation of these arguments in the other columns. For example, on his sheet for the arguments of

the opposing team, he lists the original advantages or disadvantages in the left hand column. He puts the refutation to each argument opposite that argument in the second column. He puts the opposition's reply to this refutation in the third column, his own counter-refutation in the fourth column, and so on until the end of the debate. He prepares another similar sheet for the advantages or disadvantages asserted by his own team. In this way he can tell at a glance which arguments have been answered, how they have been answered, and which have not been answered. During his conclusion of the debate, he can summarize the cases of both teams (hence the name "double-summary"), showing which arguments were established and which were not. He can thus contend that on the basis of the arguments still standing or reestablished, his own team succeeded in showing that the proposed plan should (or should not) be adopted.

It is not necessary for a team to wait until it meets another team familiar with this procedure to make use of it. In some six years of high school and college debating, we used this form in each debate and not once did we find our opponents using it. We simply reorganized our opponents' case following the double-summary method, and then proceeded to establish our own advantages or disadvantages and refute theirs.

I believe that this type of case organization improves the quality of debating in the following ways:

1. It affords less opportunity for the introduction of irrelevant material because it channels the thoughts of the speakers into the concrete advantages and disadvantages of the plans.

2. It clarifies the thinking of the audience and judge, as well as the thinking of the debaters, by presenting as the major points arguments that contribute directly, without further interpretation, to the conclusion that the plan should or should not be adopted.

3. It helps avoid wasting time. If the affirmative uses this organization, the first affirmative speaker always attempts to demonstrate that the plan will bring about at least one advantage with respect to the *status quo*. (He is not required by any rule of debate to offer such proof in the first constructive speech but he does so as a matter of good debate practice. Sooner or later the affirmative must provide this proof, for if the affirmative plan is no better than the *status quo* it should not be adopted, regardless of the merits of any possible counterplan.) Thus, if the negative decides to offer a counterplan, an affirmative speaker who spent his time talking about "need" alone would find that he had wasted his time, but an affirmative speaker who spent his time proving that his plan has one major advantage with respect to the *status quo* will at least have accomplished that much and could afford to spend the rest of his time in the debate discussing the relative merits of the counterplan and the affirmative plan. In other words, the recommended form of organization helps teams to avoid wasting their time.

It may be just a whim, but I think that to follow such a plan adds up to more constructive, original thought on the part of the debated. I know that in my own case I spent a lot of time reciting arguments from the handbooks until we worked out the new organization, and then I saw why a lot of the handbook material was irrelevant and other material was needed. Debaters tell me they have had the same experience. In any event, others may want to give this technique a trial and judge its effectiveness for themselves.

Reaching the Decision

The proper basis for judging competitive debate has constituted a source of disagreement for years. I do not wish to discuss the relative merits of some of these older and conflicting basic concepts, for two closely related principles have become so well established today that all judging is based on them. They are:

The decision must go to the team doing the better debating. The merits of the question itself are irrelevant.

But how can the judge best determine which team did the better debating? Here there is not such unanimity of thought. But since in every debate one team must more nearly succeed than the other team in proving what the proposition demands, and since the teams have so many possible cases from which to choose, it is evident that the more nearly successful team did the better debating and therefore must be given the decision. Consequently, we may state as a principle:

> The criterion for determining which team did the better debating is: Which team more nearly succeeded in doing what the proposition demands?

Translating this in terms of a proposition of policy, the principle may be stated:

> The criterion for determining which team did the better debating is: *Did the affirmative succeed in showing that the proposed plan should be adopted? If so, the affirmative did the better debating. If not, the negative did the better debating.*

This method of judging does not ignore delivery. The purpose of good delivery is to communicate ideas more effectively, and if the speaker's delivery does not do so, it is unsatisfactory in some respect. Since any judge will give more weight to an idea made clear to him than to one he vaguely grasps, delivery is automatically given the proper weight in the decision without any attempt on the part of the judge to consider it separately. In fact, the judge must not be allowed to consider it apart from the ideas presented, for so doing would actually result in counting it twice.

The same thing is true of all the other so-called "elements of good debating." Each is useful only to the extent that it communicates ideas and thus advances the case. "Skill at refutation" is valuable only to the extent that the skill is used in tearing down the opposition's case and thus in building up the speaker's own case. "Organization of material" is valuable only to the extent that it enables the team to prove its case more effectively. None of the elements of effective debating can be considered separately; each must be measured in the only accurate way—that is, in terms of the total accomplishment of the teams, the comparative degree of success of the two teams in doing what the proposition demands.

When the judge uses the above criterion and records the progress of the debate in terms of the demonstrated advantages and disadvantages of the proposed plan, my own experience indicates that the selection of the winning team is less difficult than with any other procedure with which I am familiar.

The double-summary sheet is used by the judge as a means of keeping track of the arguments presented, their refutation and counter-refutation. A pair of these sheets, as filled out by the judge of a debate in which the negative recommended retention of the *status quo*, is shown at the end of this article. In debates where the negative recommends a counterplan, the sheets appear in exactly the same form except that the negative is attempting to show the advantages of the counterplan with respect to the affirmative plan, while the affirmative is attempting to show the disadvantages of the counterplan with respect to the affirmative proposal. Otherwise the sheets used in a counterplan debate are identical with those illustrated.

Suppose that the affirmative proposes that Plan X be adopted and that the affirmative arguments in favor of the plan can be summarized by the judge in a list of three alleged advantages of the proposal. Suppose, also, that the negative recommends retention of the *status quo* and that the negative arguments

can be summarized in a list of three alleged disadvantages. The affirmative, in the opinion of the judge, successfully refuted *all* of the negative's asserted disadvantages, while the negative was unable to refute, successfully, two of the affirmative's asserted advantages. The affirmative, in consequence, showed that the plan's advantages outweigh its disadvantages and that the plan, therefore, should be adopted. The affirmative succeeded and the negative failed in doing what the proposition demanded. Therefore the affirmative did the better debating and should be given the decision.

Now suppose, in the same sort of debate, that the negative successfully refutes *all* of the asserted advantages of the plan. Here it can be seen that the affirmative failed to establish reasons for adopting the proposal. The affirmative failed and the negative succeeded in doing what the proposition demanded. Therefore the negative did the better debating and should be given the decision.

Suppose, as a third possible situation, that *some* of the alleged advantages and *some* of the alleged disadvantages of Plan X remain standing at the end of the debate. Here the judge awards the decision to the affirmative only if the demonstrated advantages of the plan outweigh the demonstrated disadvantages, considering (1) the importance of each as shown by the teams, (2) the number, if each is shown to be of equal importance, and (3) the degree of certainty attached to each after refutation and counter-refutation.

If the negative offers a counterplan instead of defending the *status quo*, the affirmative is still required to show that its plan will offer some improvement (however minor) over present conditions, for otherwise the plan should not be adopted regardless of the merits of any possible counterplan. Once this is done, the judge renders his decision in exactly the same way that he does in the debate where the negative defends the *status quo*; the only distinction is that he considers the advantages and disadvantages of the counterplan with respect to the affirmative plan, rather than the advantages and disadvantages of the affirmative plan with respect to the *status quo*.

We may summarize the various possibilities as follows:

I. *Where the negative supports the status quo*:

A. The plan is shown by the teams to have advantages and no disadvantages.
Decision: Affirmative.

B. The plan is shown to have no advantages.
Decision: Negative.

C. The plan is shown to have both advantages and disadvantages.
Decision: Either team, depending on (1) the demonstrated importance of the advantages and disadvantages, (2) the number, if each is shown to be of equal importance, and (3) the degree of certainty attached to each after refutation and counter-refutation.

II. *Where the negative supports a counterplan*:

The affirmative is required to show that its own plan is better than the *status quo*, unless the negative admits it. If the affirmative fails to prove this:

Decision: Negative.

If the affirmative does prove that its plan is better than the *status quo*, and

A. The counterplan is shown to have advantages and no disadvantages with respect to the affirmative plan.
Decision: Negative.

B. The counterplan is shown to have no advantages with respect to the affirmative plan.
Decision: Affirmative.

C. The counterplan is shown to have both advantages and disadvantages with respect to the affirmative plan.
Decision: Either team, depending on (1) the demonstrated importance of the advantages and disadvantages, (2) the number, if each is shown to be of equal importance, and (3) the degree of certainty

attached to each after refutation and counter-refutation.

If the judge is not yet thoroughly familiar with the double-summary procedure, I believe he will find it helpful to have a copy of the above outline in front of him when the time comes to translate the double-summary sheets into a definite decision. Of course, he can arrive at the same result by asking himself the question, "Did the affirmative succeed in showing that its plan should be adopted?" and then following to its conclusion the line of reasoning indicated above. But until he has done this sort of thing often enough so that it becomes second nature, I think that the outline will be a definite aid.

It can be seen that a tie in debating is impossible. Either the affirmative succeeds or does not. For instance, if the negative recommends retention of the *status quo* and the advantages of the affirmative proposal exactly balance, in the opinion of the judge, its disadvantages (as shown in the debate), the affirmative failed to give reason for adopting Plan X (*decision*: negative). Similarly, if the affirmative plan shows that Plan X is better than the *status quo*, and if the negative supports a counterplan which it shows to be of exactly equal merit to Plan X, the affirmative succeeded in demonstrating that Plan X should be adopted (*decision*: affirmative). Under every conceivable circumstance, there is some good reason why the decision must go to one team or the other.

Since we are measuring the skill of the teams, and not the merits of the question, we must not permit the judge to inject his own ideas about the merits of the topic into the decision. The debate is between the two teams; the judge is not a participant. Therefore every argument brought forth in the debate and supported by reasonable evidence or logic (as defined below), must be accepted by the judge as true until the opposing team tears it down. And once torn down, the judge must consider it out of the debate until reestablished. The opinion of the judge as to the potential strength of the various arguments has no place in the decision, and his ideas about what a good debate case on that subject would be are entirely irrelevant. Of course, judges are human and it will be difficult for them to remain objective and eliminate from the decision their own personal opinions; the most we can expect is that they will make every effort in that direction. If the decision is to be accurate, it must rest on what actually took place in the debate.

It is necessary for the judge to know what constitutes "proof" of an assertion, for otherwise he would not know whether to consider a certain point established or not. Here is the definition:

The team striving to establish an assertion must show that it is more reasonable for an intelligent but previously uninformed person to believe the assertion than to disbelieve it.

The amount of proof required in debating is generally less than that required in law. In law, the jury is expected to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty; if not convinced to this degree, they are expected to vote for his innocence. In debating, an asserted advantage or disadvantage is considered established if the weight of evidence and logic presented in the debate support it, even though there still may be room for doubt. And here is another distinction: In law the jury has the right to disbelieve written evidence or oral testimony, even though its accuracy is not disputed by the other side. In debating, we are measuring the relative skill of the two teams, not deciding the truth of the matter in question. Therefore in debating the judge is required to accept as true all evidence and all arguments

backed with reasonable proof (as defined above) until their accuracy is disputed by the other team.

A debate coach once remarked, "The implications here are pretty strong. Does this mean that the judge cannot penalize a team which uses a bare-faced lie as proof? Why not manufacture your evidence"? His point is well taken. I have never heard a debate team use manufactured evidence, but conceivably it might happen sometime. Of course it cannot be permitted, and if the judge is certain that the evidence is deliberately falsified, he is justified in giving the decision to the other team on this point alone. More often, it is simply a matter of interpretation of evidence, and if some error in logic is present, it is up to the other team to find it and point it out.

Conclusion

In what respects is the recommended double-summary procedure superior to other methods?

First, it is simple and easily applied. It should be fairly evident, even to those without previous debating experience, that when a plan's advantages are shown in the debate to outweigh its disadvantages, the plan has been shown to be good enough to warrant adoption; and therefore, since the affirmative did the better debating, it should get the decision. Using such a line of reasoning, the judge can more easily give, and justify, his decision. This simplicity is not always present in other methods of judging, particularly if the judge attempts to evaluate separately each of the so-called "elements of good debating," in which case he will find it necessary to (1) determine which elements are worth considering, (2) list them so they do not overlap, (3) determine their interrelation for the debate in progress, and (4) determine accurately the relative importance of each for the debate in question, all of which seems nearly an impossible task.

Second, the double-summary procedure is more objective than other techniques. A number of judges, following the recommended procedure, and more apt to arrive at the same decision for a given debate. The judge's personal opinions about debate technique have nothing to do with the decision, which is fortunate considering the many conflicting ideas prevalent. This objectivity, though universally recognized as desirable, is not present in any other judging procedure with which I am familiar.

Third, the double-summary procedure is more accurate than other methods. It measures the relative skill of the two teams in terms of their total accomplishments. Other judging methods, such as the individual consideration of each of a list of half a dozen elements of effective debating, are more subject to inaccuracy (1) because they fail to consider the relationship between the elements, (2) because they fail to measure adequately the relative importance of the elements, and (3) because they sometimes give a higher score for poor debating than for good debating. For example, suppose one of the elements to be evaluated is "courtesy." Sometimes in the questioning periods, with certain types of witnesses, it is more effective to use a hard-boiled manner than a soft, gentle approach. Yet in the minds of most debate judges, the debater would score higher in "courtesy" if he used the unsuccessful (in this case) gentle approach than if he used the more successful hard-boiled approach. In other words, under certain circumstances the debater who muffs his opportunities scores higher than one who takes advantage of his opportunities. Any system of judging giving this result leaves much to be de-

RESOLVED, that every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24.

AFFIRMATIVE CASE:

Asserted Advantages of Plan With Respect to *Status Quo*.

	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative
1	Would provide U. S. means to repel any attack — would save training time.	Next war will be atomic — no need for armies. First country attacked will automatically lose.	How do you know there won't be a defense? Crosby Corp. says it has one.	This is denied by all reputable scientists. Quotes. No defense except world peace.	
2	Would make U. S. more truly democratic by mixing poor and rich, white and colored, Protestant, Catholic, and Hebrew.	Why will *mixing* alone remove prejudice? Proof is needed.	Examples given where it worked. Opinions quoted.		
3	Would give uneducated and untrained men peacetime skills.	Not many skills — if it's *full-time military* training, no time for peacetime skills.			
4					

RESOLVED, that every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24.

NEGATIVE CASE:

Asserted Disadvantages of Plan With Respect to *Status Quo*.

	Negative	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
1	Would provoke war by providing U. S. leaders with power, leading to U. S. aggression.	We have had that power for a long time, but no aggression.	Look how we're interfering in Argentina. And our arms made Panama independent.		
2	Would encourage lowered moral standards.	Army has elaborate provisions and education. Movies, meetings, posters.	This is for *health*, not morals. Army makes little or no attempt to safeguard morals.	Even if Army does little, no evidence has been given to show that any individual would be less moral in Army than in private life.	Opinions quoted. Cases cited.
3	Summary— Aff.: 1 major advantage established. Neg.: 2 major disadvantages established. All shown to be of approx. equal importance.		All established with approx. equal certainty. Therefore, decision:—NEGATIVE.		
4					

sired. The double-summary procedure avoids such inaccuracies because it does not consider the individual elements separately, but measures the skill of the teams in terms of their total accomplishments.

Fourth, the double-summary procedure encourages better debating from an educational standpoint. It encourages the debater to consider each element of good debating as a means to an end only, the commnication of ideas and thus the advancement of the case. When the debate is judged in terms of a number of isolated elements, the debater cannot be blamed for emphasizing each element individually, regardless of its effect on the case, in order to make the highest possible score. Debaters have been known to make this mistake many times. If the judge is to render his decision in terms of these elements and if one of the elements to be considered is "skill in refutation," the debater cannot be blamed for refuting any and all statements of the opposing team, regardless of their importance, in order to make the best possible score. This is poor debating, of course, and the judging procedure should be one that automatically penalizes it. Since the double-summary procedure measures the skill of the teams in terms of their total accomplishments, without regard for the individual elements, anything that fails to advance the case is automatically penalized and anything that makes the case more complete and convincing is automatically rewarded; thus I believe it encourages better debating.

Although this procedure for reaching the decision did not find its way into print until 1945, debate judges have been using variations of it for years. Debaters themselves almost always expect something like it to be used, unless they are told otherwise, for nothing else really measures what they are doing. The score sheet was undeniably a step forward from the blind decision of three judges who knew nothing about debating, but even the most enthusiastic supporters of the score sheet recognize its serious flaws. The score sheet, in turn, is now giving away to the double-summary procedure, which seems, at least from experience to date, to be more accurate and objective. This judging technique, like the double-summary technique of case organization, can best be evaluated by the coach and judge in actual practice over one or more sessions.

HYACINTHS AND BISCUITS

On a Rationale for the Oral Reading of Poetry

CARL E. BURKLUND
University of Michigan

ONE who regards the oral presentation of poetry as an art cannot fail often to be disturbed by the subtleties it enfolds and the narrow margin it allows between success and failure. If he is a practitioner, in however slight a measure, he has many an occasion to wonder why this rendition has failed and that succeeded, when the intention in either case was no less devout and the love for the poem no less sincere. He is forced to earnest reflection, perhaps indeed to the search for a rationale of the art of reading poetry, in terms of which he may henceforth meet the challenge of the particular problems he must confront. Is it possible, he may ask himself, to arrive at a few basic ideas? Can he, out of the smother of his confusion, achieve some clarity of view on which to found a technique of reading?

Questions like these I, as many another, have put to myself in trying to learn how to present poetry. And what in a stumbling fashion I have concluded forms the substance of this article. But before proceeding to the argument I should like to clear the ground.

I

It is obvious that we cannot be dogmatic in any art, nor lay down narrow laws by which it must be created, or—as with poetry—how it must be presented. A disturbingly large number of interpretations of a particular poem (as of a musical composition) will strike the listener as "right"; and often a version that runs counter to our dearest preconception will possess an authority that we shall, as honest creatures, be forced to admit. Personality, intelligence, experience, vocal apparatus, and many another factor will differ in individuals and inexorably determine the character of the oral presentation. We cannot, therefore, set up an inflexible background of law. Nor can we, as a practical matter, in outlining a theory, attend to every item in its application as technique; such matters must be left to actual demonstration.

It is equally clear that the technique of any art must rest, finally, upon the character and purpose of the medium it employs. For although it may in this respect expand its potentialities far beyond the limits conceived by its pioneers, it cannot wholly transcend them. It follows, therefore, that before discussing the art of reading poetry, we must consider the implications given in its medium. What poetry can or may do, or how it should be projected orally is in a most intimate way bound up with the functions of language.

That the prime function of language is communication is universally admitted. As soon as we allow that man is a gregarious animal, we must grant as an inevitable corollary that language is an adjunct of social organization, its purpose to facilitate intercourse. It is true indeed—and not without relevance to poetry—that it may serve more egocentric aims. Sometimes it is an innocent means of syphoning off free energy, as when enviably happy souls bubble off into spontaneous tag ends of verse or nonsense syllables. Or it may serve as an instrument of psychic relief (the dubious monologues of even the best of us) by which emotions are brought to the sur-

face and exploded harmlessly. At a higher level, poetry, especially lyric poetry, illustrates to some extent the same function. But language is primarily the instrument of communication; and it seems likely enough that even in those instances when it is used as a medium of self-expression, fellow human beings form an imagined, though invisible audience.

Communication through language unquestionably obtains at different levels of intention and hence reveals different patterns of mental and verbal organization. But although this be granted, it would seem that since communication is preeminently social in character, there must be some common level, or mode of projection, that best represents success in communication. And patently that is the mode of conversation—warm, immediate, universal, human. Conversation is tolerant of all forms of material and implicity appealing because it is the spontaneous expression of the innate curiosity and sympathy of human beings. Even the best of written literature, as everyone knows, remains loyal in some degree to the spirit of conversation. It could not do less and move us.

Poetry is no exception. But at this point a difference, pertinent to a theory of oral reading, must be taken into account. Poetry is a formal art, as conversation in the same sense is not. The implications are important. Conversation represents the real world of incident and fact, of person and problem—incurably exciting, but incurably confused and localized. Poetry, however, as any art, although rooted in the actual, is in essence its idealization: a lifting of the incidental to the plane of the universal. It is not a denial of, but a fruitful reorganization of the real. To achieve this idealization in character calls for an idealization in form. Hence poetry refines and strengthens all the implicit properties of language as used in conversation: it concentrates incidental emotion; intensifies image and symbol; orders casual rhythms into design; emphasizes the melody of word sounds; makes loose syntactic relations strict; and often creates a distinguishing framework of rhyme to make apparent a new verbal structure. These are all agencies which, although serving other functions as well, combine in the large purpose of creating a psychic distance from reality, satisfying thereby an urgent need in us, not only to live in the actual, but at the same time to be at some point removed from it, that we may contemplate it in its most clear, most poignant, and most universal form.

Poetry, in short, is a union of two orders: the real in fact (the material of conversation) given the university of the imagined; the real in utterance (the diction and structure of conversation) raised to a perfection potential in it, but not hitherto attained. It is indeed, in the words of Carl Sandburg, "a synthesis of hyacinths and biscuits."

II

If this point of view is sound, then the primary need in the art of reading poetry is to achieve a simultaneous loyalty to two kinds of experience, the real and the ideal. That is: to read a poem well we must never depart too far from the level of conversation; and conversely, we must never permit our reading to remain quite at that level. If we fail in the first need, we violate the principle of reality, which is at the core of every poem. If we fail in the second, we violate the principle of ideality, which is the essence of poetry as an art form. The ratio will vary with individual and with poem, but some approved ratio must be sought and maintained.

Such a demand is more than theoretical. To retain an element of the conversational in the reading of a poem is to secure an enormous advantage at the outset: an interest and sympathy almost automatically given. It is like sending a tap root to rich and well-watered soil. The listener is unconsciously brought to the alert, receptive and waiting — this is real! this is important! But to allow the reading to rest at the unintense mark of conversation is to disappoint him in his full expectations. He has not, to be sure, thought it out; but being human (and therefore responsive to an art as well as a life situation), he implicitly awaits in poetry that heightening to intensity of the casual stuff of experience, and that lifting to ideal form of random utterance, which together make a poem a poem. Human beings are incorrigibly and forever realists and idealists at the same time — lovers of the imperfect known and the imagined perfect. Poetry by nature joins both worlds in inseparable union; a just reading must do the same.

But, one may interrupt at this point, granted for the sake of argument that the thesis is sound — to what end? What does it mean, in terms of actual technique, when applied to the thousand and one poems that form the golden treasury of any language? How can these all be submitted to a generalization so amiable that it does not discriminate between the "Ode on Immortality" and "Chicago"; between the "Congo," with its syncopated high-jinx, and Frost's "Home Burial," with its gray tonalities? The question is indeed a puzzling one. One might retort, covering a swift confusion, that while of course you cannot read the "Ode" quite as you would discuss the price of pumpkins with your farmer friend, neither can you afford to read it as though it were wholly removed from the price of pumpkins — for it is not. "Hyacinths and biscuits. . . ."

A more considered reply would explain as follows. There must be some acceptable ratio between conversation and art (or between the familiar and the austere) in the reading of any poem. But the ratio is flexible, changing with the nature of the poem; and the experienced reader will shift weight from one to the other as occasion demands. In offering, for instance, so richly formal, so heavily Latinized a poem as Thomson's "Ode to the Setting Sun" he will, while reproducing its essential grandeur, bring into his reading as much of the familiar as he possibly can. If he does not, the performance will be a virtuoso exhibition, eliciting admiration, possibly, but not love, for the gap between the poem and the listener's experience (in thought and language) will remain too great. On the other hand, in reading Fearing's "American Rhapsody" — so immediate in both content and form — he will strive for psychic distance, emphasizing by austerity of voice and stress on cadence, the separation of the poem from life itself. But before continuing with the argument, let us for a moment digress, for such a transfer of emphasis will presuppose in the reader certain decisions and acknowledgments about poetry of considerable bearing on the thesis.

The boundaries between what is and what is not poetry have never been fixed, and they never can be. At one end poetry merges imperceptibly into prose, and at the other, perhaps, into impressive nonsense. What is accepted as authentic between the two extremes fluctuates with the sensitivity, tolerance, intelligence, and personality of every one who knows poetry at all. Many a conservative will not even at this late day admit Whitman to Parnassus. Others, more tolerant, will

give a hesitant nod to the "good gray poet," but shake their heads when you proffer them E. E. Cummings or Kenneth Fearing — this may be anything you please, but it is not poetry! Many who deem themselves liberal in taste will begin to drop off when — moving to the other boundary — they are confronted with T. S. Eliot, Edith Sitwell, Marianne Moore, or Wallace Stevens. What constitutes poetry for an individual cannot be determined by law or academy; each person will decide for himself. But what he regards as outside its legitimate domain he cannot read as poetry, and should not try, for he is unable to bring to it the psychological "set" which will make its projection poetry to the listener.

Another truth, closely related to the foregoing, is no less evident: namely, that poetry as an art expression ranges from what may be called poetry of low voltage to that of high voltage. Some verse has so small a charge (Wordsworth's lesser blank verse; much of Edgar Lee Masters) that we are uncertain whether to call it poetry at all. No one, on the other hand, would question the right of Shelley's "Ode to the West wind" or Milton's "Lycidas" to be called poetry. The difference here suggested has nothing to do with significance of content or "truthfulness to life," but with the artistic pressure to which materials have been submitted, and the perfection of form into which they have been cast.

To return from our digression — we may now draw a practical conclusion. Since poetry varies in aesthetic quality, inevitably in some instances a reading will have to be "stepped up" and in others "toned down." To illustrate. If I believe, as I do, that *Spoon River* is poetry — yes, but poetry with a low voltage, almost at the level of conversation —then I shall be forced, if my listener is to feel it as poetry, to magnify every ar element in it to achieve the require ideality. I could almost, if I wanted read it as prose — but not quite, for I consider it poetry.

I do not believe that in so intensifying the given I am doing violence to the will of its creator, or injecting values not already there; I am simply revealing the properties that he either would not or could not make vividly apparent. By increasing "distance" in my reading of *Spoon River*, for example, and by emphasizing cadence, I am making "Perry Zoll" the symbol of all prophets rejected at home, and "Archibald Higbie" the symbol of all ineffectual artists who cannot rise above the assumed limitations of their environment. I am not being unfaithful to the genius of the poems; I am only bringing out clearly their inherent ideal or universal qualities. The function of any interpreter is to recreate the spirit as well as the letter of a text. At times this calls for magnification, yes even a degree of artistic distortion of the original.

Suppose, on the other hand, that I read Poe's "Ulalume" or Swinburne's "Garden of Proserpine." Here there is no question of the verse being "charged," of possessing "distance." The poems are more "art" than "conversation." I may, if I wish, offer them in a sort of ecstatic chant, stressing their separateness from the daily concerns of human beings. And no doubt, if my voice is good, the result will give pleasure. But in so doing I shall run the risk of cutting poetry away from life, and of transforming a language art into music. Neither action is justified. Poetry grows out of and should return to life itself if it is to satisfy a central need in us. And although poetry may, as Pater observed, aspire toward the condition of music, it is not and cannot become wholly one with music.

I must not, certainly, in reading Poe and Swinburne, reduce them to the dull level of conversation — that indeed would be fatal. But while preserving their richness in melody and meter, I must to some extent return them from the aloof region of art to the warm and near areas of common experience.

The only question is how. Or, to extend and rephrase the issue: How can we step up and tone down a reading of poetry to secure an agreeable ratio? It would seem that two factors join in determining the character of a verse presentation: the psychological "set" of a reader, and what in spirit and form is given in the poem itself. If I come with a prose fixation of mind, I inevitably let my voice in inflection and tempo slip into the easy groove of conversation. I underline the text rather than the context; make the rhythms too incidental; obscure the various properties that make a poem a work of art.

I must, then, when I read verse of low aesthetic vitality, make my voice by tonal depth and a certain austerity, by inflections that catch and amplify overtones, reach beyond the realm of everyday and signify clearly to the listener that it is indeed poetry that I am reading. I must do more. Since it is rhythm that first of all creates form and "distance" in verse, I must subtly bring out the poetic rhythms that I discover in order that I may create an art framework. I must also make full and skillful use of other poetic adjuncts: return, alliteration, parallelism, melody, and the like.

The toning down process is more difficult, for it demands, never a destruction of the art values of a poem, but the employment of means whereby these shall not seem too far removed from our immediate concerns. The voice must not — as it frequently is in highly formalized verse — be pitched at too grandiose a level, implying that now, of course, we are soaring into the empyrean, far above the ruck and litter of things. To do so is only to alienate my audience. It is quite possible, and an advantage, to let it come down and hover not too far above the reach of conversation; to inject into it something of the simple earnestness with which we deal with mundane things. Cory's "Heraclitus," lamenting in severely restrained lines the death of a friend, can by an unaffected simplicity of voice carry with it (as was intended) a poignant and immediate sense of loss — something that might happen to you or to me. It is quite possible, too, without ruining the art of a poem, to impose upon the given meter what one may call a life rhythm: the shifting of tempos and pauses, the intimate accelerations and hesitancies that suggest the unpremeditated character of language as used in conversation. It is hard to imagine any successful reading, say, of Whitman's "O Captain! My Captain!" that *did not* so restate the original. Charles Laughton's superb radio rendition, at the time of President Roosevelt's death, of the first part of Whitman's "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" had its great power precisely in this imposition of a life rhythm on the poem itself. And, finally, rhyme and melody can be made richly authentic and still not obsessive; the images penetrating and bright without becoming overaccentuated. I believe, once again, that such a process of toning down does not violate the spirit of the original; it is simply bringing poetry to that level where it was intended to be — where it can relate intimately to men and affairs.

III

These observations on the oral reading of verse may seem too general, but it

is difficult, if not impossible, to make them much more specific. Their final validity would call for demonstration rather than discussion. Since this, of course, is out of question here, let us in a few concluding paragraphs indicate upon what, in addition to analysis, the thesis is based. It rests upon the writer's reactions while listening to various poets, either in person or in recordings, read their own verse.

Frankly, I believe that few poets read their poetry well. Such a conclusion appears startling, for one naturally assumes that an artist in creation should also be an artist in recreation. But upon second thought this no more follows than that a composer must of necessity be a fine pianist; or conversely, that an excellent teacher of violin must himself be a virtuoso. Long before analyzing why, I listed as among the best E. E. Cummings, Archibald MacLeish, Louis Untermeyer, James Weldon Johnson, and W. H. Auden; and as among the less convincing Robert Frost, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Robinson Jeffers, Robert P. Tristram Coffin, and — incredibly bad — Edwin Markham.

After some study, I came to the conclusions given in this article. Untermeyer, although handicapped by a mediocre voice, reads with amazing effectiveness, largely, I believe, because he makes poetry close to, but not one with, conversation. Cummings and MacLeish (blessed with beautiful voices) achieve more "distance" than Untermeyer, but present their verse with the appealing directness of a personal plea. Auden reads his poem on the death of Yeats with an austere but simple gravity, much as one imagines Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address. In these, representative of my first group, I have found an acceptable blend of art and conversation.

Frost, on the other hand, brings his reading too close to conversation for my taste — closer indeed than the poetry itself warrants. Miss Millay, I feel, overdramatizes, implying sublimities that neutralize the real sublimity of her verse (I am thinking especially of "Renascence"). Markham reduces his powerful "Man With the Hoe" to melodrama by an "artish" attitudinizing; the reading is neither too remote nor too familiar, but just plain bad.

After much listening I was driven to the conclusion that the best presentation of verse — at least for me — was that which seemed not wholly conversation and not wholly art, but an inseparable fusion of the two. A subsequent analysis of the twofold nature of poetry, as joining the real and the ideal, confirmed an intuitive approval.

THEATRE AT SHRIVENHAM

HERSCHEL L. BRICKER
University of Maine

THE U. S. Army's Shrivenham American University, located in the Vale of the White Horse, Berkshire, England – a two hour train ride from London and in the shadows of Stratford-upon-Avon and Oxford – proved to be a new and valuable experiment in education. It was in a real sense an American University, with Sections of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Journalism, Liberal Arts, and the Sciences, and with American instructors and students.[1] Its principal difference from other American universities was that the instructors and students were dressed in army uniforms, and that the 700-acre campus a modern British Army Post, was on a foreign soil.

It was at this university, for each of its two eight-week terms that four thousand ex-combat soldiers came to study while awaiting shipment home. The Army's Educational Program provided them with this opportunity to orient them to civilian life and to aid them in regaining mental flexibility.[2] They were permitted to enroll in courses of their choice, and they were provided with the usual extracurricular activities and social functions that have become a part of any American university—orchestra, chorus, football, basketball, theatre, movies, and dances. They had, however, an extra feature that no other American university could offer – the advantage of supplementing their formal classroom work with field trips about England. This provided a rich experience which most of them normally would never have had.

[1] As SAU was organized, the Academic Divisions constituted the University proper; the Sections and Branches correspond to colleges and departments.

[2] See *History of Shrivenham American University*, chap. I, p. 10.

I

It was at this new Shrivenham American University that I served as head of the Theatre Branch. Upon arrival, the day classes started, I found only two men assigned to Theatre. They were First Lieutenant W. L. Dingwell, formerly head of drama at the University of Buffalo, and Corporal H. W. Butler, formerly an assistant in drama at the University of California at Los Angeles. These two capable men and I, as a staff nucleus, began the task of bringing the Theatre Branch to life.

Our experience taught us the full significance of the expression starting from scratch. There was no plant, no equipment, and no library; and with a staff of only three it was obvious to us that we could not meet the student demand.

Our only certainty was that we had between two and three hundred registered and extracurricular students, and that they were theatre hungry GIs who were anxious to start their training from where it was ended on going into the service.

What should be the approach to this rather large problem?

The objectives for the Branch were set down as follows: To permit the students as much freedom for experimentation as possible; to encourage those wishing to write, through the production of their plays; and to acquaint them with as much of the English theatre and its tradition as possible through seeing plays, hearing guest lectures from the

professional stage, and joining conducted tours to theatre centers.

The immediate problems were to find an adequate number of instructors, to construct a theatre in an available building, and to acquire the necessary materials needed for normal theatre function. In good Army fashion this all had to be done at once. It was not an easy assignment.

With the splendid cooperation of all of the University's administrative officers, however, the Branch was operating reasonably well within the month. Military personnel had been requisitioned to augment the staff. There were plays and reference books on the shelves—not necessarily the plays and books we wanted, but those available at Samuel French's, London. A room, seating an audience of a hundred and fifty, which had been equipped with stage, draperies, lighting instruments, and a light control board, served as our Laboratory Theatre.

Those first weeks were filled with long, strenuous days, and among them were some nerve shattering hours. The lead cable into the Laboratory Theatre was connected to the switchboard just one hour before the opening curtain on our first production, *Home for the Winter*, a student's adaptation of an O'Henry story. This was particularly trying for all concerned!

I learned two things about requisitioning that first month. The first was that requistions had to be followed up with telephone or personal calls, and that they often required hand processing. This required additional time for office hours and innumerable trips to the University's supply office at London and to the supply depots. The second thing I learned was that one had to be explicit when writing a requistion for theatrical equipment. An order for twenty-five stage levels (which are standard stage units designed for Special Service) proved on delivery to be twenty-five carpenter's levels. A supply sergeant, who had never heard of stage levels, probably used a few choice Army adjectives when filling the order.

The demand for theatre on the part of both the student participants and the soldier-student audience was great. The only reasonably large theatre, seating five hundred, which was used by Special Service and the Music Branch as well as the Theatre Branch, proved to be occupied too regularly for theatre needs. There was inadequate time for setting up scenery and for dress rehearsals. As a result, four adjoining gun bays, about 50 by 60 feet each, were assigned to the Theatre Branch. These were made into an auditorium, which seated an audience of three hundred and fifty; a stage, 27 by 36 feet, with an adjustable proscenium; dressing rooms; and a scene dock and scenery construction area. This theatre was completed for productions during the second term.

Because of my late arrival, the Section Chief, with no knowledge of the proposed theater program, offered only three courses for the first term. The courses were: Beginning Acting, Play Direction and Production, and History of Theatre. This was desirable in the sense that the Branch was not prepared to accommodate a large number of students. The few courses offered, however, proved to be a genuine disappointment to the students themselves. They were older than the average college student, and many had had nonprofessional and professional direction, scene designing, or acting experience. The enrollment probably would have been tripled had other and advanced courses been offered.

For the second term the following courses were added: Advanced Acting, Stagecraft, Scene Designing, Play Direc-

tion, Theatre Laboratory (a laboratory for actual scene construction and acting projects), and Playwriting. Additional courses would have been offered and more divisions created had it been possible to acquire a larger and more experienced faculty. There was a genuine need for a project course for the more advanced students; but it would have been unwise to have introduced the course since there was an inadequate number of experienced teachers. It would also have been unfair to the students to have admitted more than could successfully be instructed in the four divisions of acting, for example, with sixty-two students already enrolled. It is generally conceded, I believe, that even fifteen students to an acting division are too many for good instruction; and this is applicable to theatre courses in general. Thus it was that we were never in a position to meet the entire student demand.

II

It is not possible to discuss here all of the theatre courses offered at SAU. Playwriting proved to be an interesting course, and perhaps will serve to indicate the approach made to all of the courses taught.

Playwriting was originally designed for six students, and it was to have been conducted according to the conference method. The registering officers had been instructed to admit only those who had had work published or had a previous writing course. By these standards, however, it was necessary to admit eighteen men. Between thirty and forty applied for admission. It was regrettable that these additional men could not have been accommodated in a beginning playwriting course, because they seemed, like a great majority of SAU students proved themselves to be, sincere and conscientious.

The students of playwriting were young men who possessed an abundance of material, mostly of a serious nature, which was close to their hearts. They had done much thinking during those hours a combat soldier finds for philosophical reflection. With this thought in mind, the students were permitted to write either short or long plays, depending upon the nature of their subject matter. They were advised not to give consideration to the shortness of the term, on the assumption that if a writer has something to say he cannot necessarily be confined to an eight-week period. And these young men obviously had much to say.

Their subject matter fell into categories from farce to drama. No one attempted tragedy. They made use of symbolism, stylization, and realism. Four of the students attempted subjects on politics and war, which projected years into the future. All of the men were seeking a writing style of their own.

The students were requested to put their proposed material into outline form. With these outlines at hand the instructor gave suggestions and criticisms to the students at conferences. Their individual problems were also discussed in the classroom. At the various stages of development, the scripts were also independently read by the instructor and three critic-readers, and the written criticisms were given to the writers. This stimulated careful and critical thinking on the writers' part, because the criticisms were often in disagreement.

When a script was thought to be developed sufficiently, it was cast, with students from the acting and laboratory classes reading, and placed in rehearsal under the direction of a staff member. The author was required to be present at all readings. He was granted final approval of those chosen to play the

roles. He was also expected to attend all rehearsals, and to make re-writes when it seemed desirable to himself or to the director. The instructor acted as a supervising director for all productions.

Not all of the students, and none of those writing three-act plays, found it possible to complete their pieces. None of the plays produced could be termed a finished product; but the staging of such plays as were sufficiently completed gave the authors a chance to study their efforts during the rehearsal period—to see where their plays were weak in construction, and to gauge their intended dramatic effects through audience reactions.

The members of the entire class also profited from the production experience through open and free classrooms discussions of each play before and after it had been staged. The rehearsals were never closed to members of the Playwriting class, and as a result all had a chance to see the production of each play as it developed.

These playwriting students were intelligently keen and critical. If they were comparatively representative of the young playwrights over the country, then the theatre, within the next ten or fifteen years, will, I believe, fall heir to a number of good dramatists. One member of the class, should all go well, will have seen his initial effort produced on Broadway by the time this article goes to print.

The theatre courses offered at SAU were supplemented by general lectures. The guest lectures, from the professional theatre and universities, were sometimes engaged to deliver a series of talks on subjects such as the Plays of Shakespeare. Among the visitors were Margaret Boyd, Ernest Burbridge, Joyce Grenfell, and Allardyce Nicoll.

Ivor Brown, drama critic and editor of the *London Observer*, was also on the lecture program. His subject concerned the problems of a critic; and in the evening, after the performance of a current bill of one-act plays, he kindly obliged with a thorough criticism of the presentation. The many additional contributions which the lecturers made, such as this, proved to be of special value to the theatre students.

III

In addition to the program of lectures, "one-day" courses were introduced at the opening of the second term. These were arranged by the British Council, an organization which proved to be most helpful to the Theatre Branch in many ways. The entire theatre student body were taken by busses, usually on a Saturday, to a "scene of action" in the British theatre.

One trip was made to Sir Barry Jackson's Birmingham Repertory Theatre. Lectures were given on the current production, *King John*, by Sir Barry and Peter Brooke, the director. Following lunch as guests of the British Council, the students attended the matinee performance of the play.

An especially interesting production on the one-day program was Sir Lewis Casson's *Saint Joan*. As Sir Lewis had acted in the initial London production and as he had been in close association with George Bernard Shaw when the latter was writing it, the students were given an opportunity to see the play staged as nearly as possible as Mr. Shaw wished it done. At a forum discussion of the production the following day, the students unanimously agreed that the American's idealized presentation of St. Joan, as Katharine Cornell interpreted the role, was more to their liking. They were, however, immensely interested in the "English way" of staging the play.

During the first term, when the Shake-

speare Festival was in season, the SAU Transportation Section made it possible for the students to see the seaon's program of plays. Trips to Stratford-on-the-Avon were made semiweekly. A large number of theatre students could also be found on the Friday's leave train, which ran each week of both terms, London bound for more theatre. Those who remained behind were usually actors who had been cast in a forthcoming production and who had voluntarily restricted themselves to the Post in the interest of their own rehearsals. Then too, there was the Playhouse, a repertory company at Oxford, where the students frequently saw excellent theatre.

IV

At the conclusion of the second term and the University, statistics revealed that the Theatre Branch had staged twenty shows, ten of which were from original scripts. They collectively provided a diversified program, including productions of a version of *The Merchant of Venice*, *The Imaginary Invalid*, *Ten Nights in a Bar Room*, and student-written musical comedies, revues, and one-act plays.

One original piece, *The American Revue*, by Don Richardson, a student assistant, was prepared solely for British audiences, and was first played at Swindon as part of an British-American soldier show. It depicted scenes of American life throughout the United States, first as the Britisher had come to know the American through the movies and then as he actually is. Its popularity was great, and the demand for it could not possibly be met.

The Theatre Branch productions were given seventy performances; and thousands of faculty members, soldier students and English friends provided the audiences. No record of admission was kept, because no charge was made, but every performance played to packed houses.

At the second term's end, there were eighteen members on the teaching and production staff, all of whom, with the exception of myself, were Army officers and enlisted personnel. They proved themselves to be keen young men with an aptitude for theatre, and with an urge for experimentation in theatre production.

Not infrequently, between eleven and twelve o'clock at night, when the rehearsals were over and the "English, WAC, and Army Nurse" actresses had retired, resounding laughter and applause could be heard coming from the Laboratory Theatre. One who was sufficiently curious to step inside would find an impromptu show in progress. Staff members and students alike participated in these impromptu efforts; and occasionally the Branch head, along with the others, would find himself the subject of a good natured ribbing. It was typical relaxation for a conscientious and hard working theatre group.

It could not be said that the calibre of work done in theatre at SAU was always good in quality, either in the classroom or on the stage. Added to the normal problems of operating an educational theatre were many distractions. Eight weeks is too short a time to warrant perfect coordination between course work and production activity even under favorable conditions, and obviously the conditions were not always ideal. At no time was it possible to obtain all the materials which were needed; and this sometimes limited the scenery and costume designers.[3] The responsibilities attached to the development of the physical plant throughout the two

[3] Although costumes were sometimes designed for musical comedies and revues, most of the costumes used were obtained from London houses on reverse Lend-Lease.

terms, the daily problem of requisitioning transportation for carrying several dozen English actresses to and from nearby towns for the rehearsals of three or four simultaneous productions, and the insufficiency of standard play scripts necessary for intelligent casting—these indicate but a few of the distractions.

In one sense the handicaps and problems, however, served a purpose. They proved to be a challenge to the staff and students alike. Probably no other theatre department in an American University, with the exception of the Theatre Branch at the Army's Biarritz American University under the direction of Dr. Hubert Heffner, was ever developed so completely in as short a period of time as the Theatre Branch at SAU.[4] This would not have been possible had it not been for the helpful and sympathetic administration of Brigadier General Claude M. Thiele, Commandant, the fine hospitality and splendid cooperation of our British hosts, and the genuine sincerity and superior quality of the soldier students.

All in all, the program proved to be an interesting experiment, and, as I believe, a successful one.

[4] For an account of the Theatre Branch at Biarritz American University see Dr. Heffner's article in the July, 1946 issue of *Theatre Arts*.

SOME USES OF THE "FRAME" IN PLAYWRITING

BARNARD HEWITT
Brooklyn College

THE recent success of *The Glass Menagerie* and of *I Remember Mama*, both of which make use of the dramatic "frame," calls attention to a dramaturgical device, which, although far from common, has been used frequently enough in the history of drama to warrant analysis. Such a "frame" is composed of one or more characters distinct in time, place, plane of reality, or style, from the characters who present the play's major action. The characters of the "frame" begin and end the play and may appear at intervals between episodes of the major action. Plays like Barrie's *A Kiss for Cinderella* which present a dream sequence within the major action do not fall into this category. *The Emperor Jones* and *Beggar on Horseback*, in which the final action occurs in the frame are borderline cases.

One is likely to think of the dramatic "frame" first as a device for presenting fantasy or for representing a reality different from that of every day. In Hauptmann's *The Assumption of Hannele*, the realistic frame provides a take-off for the playwright's flight into the beautiful vision of Hannele's assumption into Heaven and a safe landing when his flight is done. Kaufman and Connelly use the device in much the same way to frame Neil McRae's dream in *Beggar on Horseback*. In one of the oldest extant examples, Peale's *The Old Wives Tale*, the realistic English rustics provide an earthy frame for the fanciful potpourri of the play proper. And although the Stage Manager in *Our Town* fulfills more important functions, his presence makes possible the transition from the realism of the earlier scenes to the fantasy of the graveyard scene. The device is not obvious in O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*; nevertheless, the first and last scenes serve to frame the

delirium of Jones' fear-stricken flight through the jungle, just as the first and last scenes of Hauptmann's play serve to frame the delirium of Hannele's deathbed.

Also quick to spring to mind are the plays which use the "frame" as a means of satirizing or burlesquing drama and the theatre. Among the older plays, Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*, and Sheridan's *The Critic* each used the device primarily to ridicule the playwriting and acting of its own day. More recently Shaw has found it, in *Fanny's First Play*, a handy means of ridiculing dramatic critics and their criticism.

However, these are not the only, nor even the commonest, uses of the "frame." In *The Old Wives Tale* Clunch, Madge, Antic, Frolic, and Fantastic provide comedy lacking in the action of the play proper. The famous Induction of *The Taming of the Shrew* indicates Shakespeare's intention of providing a "frame" of additional comic action in the joke played on Christopher Sly, perhaps to lengthen the performance time, perhaps to provide a role for a popular comedian. The Citizen and his Wife, in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, provide a great deal of comedy of a realistic type, contrasting both with serious romanticism of the Jasper-Luce plot and with the slapstick burlesque of Ralph's adventures. In *Fanny's First Play* the prologue and epilogue supply additional and contrasting comedy.

Indeed, it is as contrast that the "frame" functions most frequently: contrast between the real and the fantastic in *The Old Wives Tale*, in *Hannele*, in *Beggar on Horseback*, in *The Emperor Jones*; contrast between the real and the theatrical in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, *The Rehearsal*, *The Critic*, and *Fanny's First Play*.

The "frame" has frequently been used for exposition. From the opening scene of *Hannele*, we learn of the little girl's sufferings, of her longing for her mother, for death, and for the consolation of Heaven, all that is necessary to an understanding of the delirium that is to follow. Similarly in the opening scene of *Beggar on Horseback*, we meet Neil, his fiancee, Gladys Cady, her odious family, and Cynthia Mason; and we learn of the conflict which is to give rise to Neil's dream. O'Neill in the opening scene of *The Emperor Jones* lays with great care the foundation for Jones' disintegration through fear, the murders in the United States, the story of the Silver bullet, spells, ghosts, witchdoctors, all are introduced in the last conversation between Jones and Smithers. And the fatal tom-toms begin in the opening scene.

The "frame" becomes even more useful as a means of exposition when it appears throughout, instead of merely at the beginning. In *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, the Citizen's Wife helps set the scene for each of Ralph's exploits by demanding that the boy appear in situations which suit her fancy. The Stage Manager in *Our Town* not only tells the audience directly what the scene and nature of the play are but also sets the stage and introduces the characters for each of its episodes. Similarly, in *The Glass Menagerie*, Tom, although he speaks less frequently than does the Stage Manager in *Our Town*, not only introduces the characters and action, but also comments on both, reminding the audience from time to time of the background of world events against which the homely action is played. In *I Remember Mama* Van Druten uses Katrin not only in the usual fashion to intro-

duce scenes and characters, but also in one instance to permit the telescoping of a number of Mr. Hyde's evenings of reading into one scene, without departing unduly from the realistic style. The old actor reads bits from several different books, and Katrin furnishes the transitions.

Occasionally, the "frame" has been used to set the tone or the mood of the action which it encloses. As soon as the curtain has risen on *The Glass Menagerie*, Tom tells the audience that this is a play of remembrance, that it is sentimental, that it is not realistic. In similar fashion, the Stage Manager prepares the audience for the quiet, sentimental, homely tone of *Our Town*, and for the presentational style of its staging. Dialogue, rather than direct address to the audience is the medium in the opening scene of *The Emperor Jones*, but the flight of the last of the native servants, Smitty's sneering warnings, and the start of the tom-toms set up a tension with an undercurrent of the fear which is to be the mood and theme of the play.

The "frame" can give punctuation and continuity to the play of many scenes. One expects to find it so used in Elizabethan drama. The comments of Madge and the rustics serve that purpose in *The Old Wives Tale*, as do the comments of the Citizen and his Wife, who speak after nearly every scene, indeed, after nearly every important exit, in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Similarly, the incoherent succession of burlesque episodes in *The Rehearsal* is held together by the comments of Johnson, Smith, and Bayes, and the episodes in *The Critic* by the remarks of Dangle, Sneerwell, and Puff. The Stage Manager in *Our Town*, by commenting on the action and by setting up the dummy scenery and properties, performs much the same function. In all these examples, the "frame" provides the kind of continuity which a master of ceremonies frequently gives to the otherwise unconnected skits and musical numbers of revue.

One might expect to find the "frame" used to perform another function of the master of ceremonies, namely, to cover changes of scenery, but this does not appear to be the case in the plays which come to mind, unless the Stage Manager's shifting of properties in *Our Town* can be taken as an example. Even in *I Remember Mama*, where the "frame" might have been so used, all the shifts except one are obviously covered by scenes played on the small side stages: The shift from Mama's house to Uncle Chris' bedroom may be covered in part by a "frame" speech of Katrin's, but the telephone scene which precedes it is probably sufficient for that purpose.

Although the continuity type of "frame" serves to invest heterogeneous dramatic material with some effect of unity, the effect is much stronger if the "frame" contributes one or more characters to the action which it encloses. In *Hannele*, nearly all the characters of the "frame" reappear as characters in Hannele's delirium, some of them little changed, but Sister Martha transformed into the angelic Deaconess, and the Schoolmaster, into the mysterious Stranger. Similarly, the characters of the "frame" in *Beggar on Horseback* become the characters, somewhat transformed, of Neil's dream. The fact that Tom in *The Glass Menagerie* functions both as "frame" and as principal character in the action contributes greatly to the effect of unity. Katrin serves in the same way to unify the variety of episodes in *I Remember Mama*. The high degree of unity achieved in *The Emperor Jones* is due in large part to the fact that Jones

is the principal character both of the "frame" and of the enclosed action.

I Remember Mama appears to be unique in its use of the "frame" to create climax. Mama is clearly the principal character of the story, but Van Druten has used Katrin's ambition to become a writer as the recurrent theme, and with great ingenuity has made of it the "frame" and a good deal of the substance of the play. As the curtain rises, we see Katrin grown up, sitting at her desk finishing a story. She starts to read it aloud: "For as long as I could remember, the house on Steiner Street had been home." As she reads, the inner curtains part on the childhood scene she is describing. All of Katrin's succeeding expository speeches are cast in the form of excerpts from her story. In the play proper, Katrin's ambition appears from time to time, more frequently and with greater importance as the end approaches. Finally, a $500 check arrives with the announcement that she has had a story accepted, and in a glow of happy achievement, Katrin sits down to read it to her admiring family. Thus the final curtain falls, as the opening curtain had risen, on the words: "For as long as I could remember, the house on Steiner Street had been home." When one considers how episodic the play is, the effect of climax is surprisingly strong.

If we may take as representative the plays analysed in this essay, the "frame" appears to be more effective the more fully it is integrated with the action which it contains. An effect of integration may be achieved, as in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and in *Our Town*, by the omnipresence of the "frame", even when there is little attempt at actual integration. However, the effect of unity is much greater when the character who provides the frame, is also a principal in the action, as is Tom in *The Glass Menagerie* and Katrin in *I Remember Mama*.

Complete integration, however, appears to be achieved not through the omnipresence of the "frame", even when the characters of the "frame" appear also in the action, but rather through a gradual transition from "frame" to principal action. *Hannele* presents an interesting example of this technique. The play opens on a note of sordid realism among the inmates of a poorhouse. The Schoolmaster and Seidel, a wood-cutter, rush in carrying Hannele, whom the woodcutter has saved from drowning in a pond. She has tried to kill herself. They wrap her up and give her a hot drink; the Doctor examines her; and Sister Martha comes to nurse her. Hannele thinks she sees her brutal step-father, Mattern, but Sister Martha tells her it is imagination. The Sister leaves to get some hot compresses, and while she is gone, the figure of Mattern appears, visible this time to the audience also. Hannele, terrified, gets out of bed and falls unconscious to the floor. Sister Martha returns and gets Hannele back to bed. We are on the plane of reality again, but not for long. Hannele smells lilacs and hears angels singing. The light dims and in the darkness Sister Martha is replaced by an apparition of Hannele's dead mother. After giving Hannele the Key of Heaven, she departs in darkness. Children are heard singing and, then angels, as the curtain falls on Act I. Act II begins once more on the plane of reality with a brief scene between Sister Martha and Hannele. Then the Black Angel appears, and Sister Martha slips away, to return shortly as the white-winged Deaconess who shields Hannele from the destroyer. Thereafter, the flow of fantasy swells uninterrupted to its peak in the assumption scene.

The Emperor Jones exhibits a similar

pattern of gradual transition from reality to delirium. The transition, in this case, however, is achieved not so much by the alternation of reality and fantasy as by a continuous slipping away from reality into the ever-accelerating tide of fear. The play begins ominously, but on a plane of complete sanity. The natives have risen against Jones, but proud and confident of his cunning and his strength, he plans to escape them through the jungle. He is prepared: he has explored the paths, he has cached food at the jungle's edge, he has his revolver with six bullets, five lead and one silver, so that if the worst comes he can die in style. Scene Two is at twilight on the edge of the jungle which looms dark beyond. Jones enters tired but still confident, still seeing things as they are. He'll find his cached food, eat, and push on. But he can't find the food, and the Little Formless Fears struggle up out of the surrounding gloom. Alarmed, he fires one of his precious bullets at them. They fade away, and emboldened, he starts into the jungle. Scene Three finds him momentarily cheered by the rising moon, but in its light he sees Jeff, whom he had killed years before in a quarrel over a crap game. He banishes the phantom with another shot, but now the tom-toms sound louder, and he plunges wildly into the underbrush. The next four scenes follow the same pattern, each beginning on a more desperate pitch, each mounting to a higher peak of panic than the one before, until Jones fires his last bullet, the treasured silver one, at the vision of the Witch Doctor and the Crocodile God, and falls exhausted to the ground.

Both these plays, it is interesting to note, close with an abrupt return to reality. In *The Emperor Jones* the final scene is at the point where Jones first entered the jungle, just before daybreak the next morning. Smitty is talking quietly with the native soldiers who await the return of their oppressor. The dialogue is slow. There is only the beat of the tom-toms, now very loud, to remind us of the terrors of the night. A shot rings out. The tom-toms are silent. The soldiers enter with Jones' body. In *Hannele*, the return to reality is even more abrupt. Angels surround the transfigured Hannele, singing: "We bear thee away to the Heavenly Rest;" the stage grows dark, and then as their voices die away, lightens again to reveal the almshouse as it was at the beginning: Hannele, once more a poor sick child, lies on the cot; the Doctor bends over her with a stethoscope; Sister Martha, holding a candle, stands anxiously by.

If one may judge from these two plays and from *Beggar on Horseback*, the "frame" is an effective device for presenting action in the realm of fantasy or on a plane of reality different from that of every day. Some such device appears to be essential. Elmer Rice's *American Landscape* attempts to do without one. The play may have other faults, but the mingling of the quick and the dead — the living Dales with the ghosts of the dead Dales, Moll Flanders, and Harriet Beecher Stowe — is what makes it fundamentally unacceptable.

However, themes which require treatment on more than one plane of reality are comparatively few, and therefore, it is as a device for simplifying the exposition and for unifying the variety of scenes in the episodic play that the "frame" is likely to be most useful. Today's playwright, faced with the problem of dramatizing a novel or of treating a contemporary subject in the episodic form which the moving pictures have made popular, may find the dramatic "frame" exactly the device he needs.

IS THERE A WORD FOR APHASICS?

JEANETTE O. ANDERSON
Louisiana State University

WHEN children are learning to speak, they use first nouns, then verbs, later pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions. When adults learn a new language, they proceed in the same fashion, whether the new language be foreign in the sense of being a part of the culture of a nation other than their native one or foreign in the sense of being the terminology of a field of knowledge strange to them. Whatever the language, nouns always come first.

In our study of aphasias, we have in over eighty years of more and less objective researches mastered only the nouns, and not all of those. When we attempt to define or explain aphasia we find our linguistic deficiency all too real and apparent. Yet, if we would discuss aphasia, we must try to bound the limits of our discussion with words. We must follow the injunction Voltaire is alleged to have given a friend, "If you would discuss with me, you must define your terms."

I

Whenever we essay a definition of our term, our noun, "aphasia", we encounter semantic difficulties. We start out, "Aphasia is. . . ." And we learn that "is" is not the verb for aphasia. We begin again, "Aphasia seems to be. . . ." We despair and wonder if any form of "to be" is meet with our noun. We must progress to verbs, though, if the noun is to acquire and so convey meaning.

With this need in mind, we pursue our quest, remembering as we run something about fools rushing. If, however, speech correctionists can lay any claim to angelic ancestry, such information has failed to get into the record. So we rush to define the term we would discuss. The dictionary offers: "Aphasia, loss of speech as a result of cerebral affection." That covers a good deal of ground. A standard medical dictionary amplifies the stark statement of its etymological brother: "Aphasia, a weakening or loss of the faculty of language in any of its forms—reading, writing, speaking, and the appreciation of the written, printed, or spoken word—independent of disease of the vocal organs or of the mind."[1] Paul Broca in 1861 defined what he called aphemia and what has come to be called aphasia as "disorders of articulated language." So spoke the neurologist.[2] Weisenburg and McBride have been somewhat more specific: "Aphasia is a disorder manifested chiefly in language processes. Thus far agreement is fairly general, but beyond this preliminary statement there are great differences of opinion." A neurologist and a psychologist collaborated in this cautious definition.[3]

Our definition of aphasia has progressed from the complete loss of speech to disorders in all language processes. We still need to clarify the meaning of the term to the speech correctionist. West defines *Dys*phasias, not *A*phasias, as disorders of linguistic symbolization, and goes on to say:

> Many cases of speech disorder are to be understood not primarily as defects of expression, *i.e.*, of phonation and articulation, but as a failure of symbolization,—the faculty of forming, re-

[1] *Stedman's Practical Medical Dictionary* (14th ed., Baltimore, 1939), p. 76.

[2] J. M. Nielsen, *Agnosia, Apraxia, Aphasia* (Los Angeles, 1936), chap. I.

[3] Theodore Weisenburg and Katharine E. McBride, *Aphasia* (New York, 1935), p. 34.

taining, and reproducing mental concepts in association with purely arbitrary combinations of speech sounds. These cases are called dysphasic. The dysphasic's failure properly to say the word *match*, for example, is due not to a lack of potential motor skill, but rather to a failure in his ability to associate three items of his experience into one integrated reaction: (1) the match as a real object of sense, *i.e.*, of sight, sound, smell, etc.; (2) the sound *match*, which has by pure human convention come to represent the real object; and (3) the neuro-muscular reaction involved in uttering the spoken word *match*. Related to this dysphasia proper are specialized deficiencies: dysgraphia, difficulty in writing arbitrary symbols; dyslexia, difficulty in interpreting these written symbols; dyspraxia, difficulty in making purposeful use of well-known objects. Unless otherwise indicated, the term dysphasia designates language disorders of the sort described above, caused by abnormalities of the association areas of the cerebrum.[4]

Anyone who has worked with aphasic patients knows that no one of these definitions, not even the last cogent statement by a speech pathologist, is either comprehensive or completely satisfactory. Aphasia is a failure of symbolization, true, but every case of aphasia presents a different complex composite of aphasic manifestations. A working concept of aphasia for the speech correctionist, then, defines aphasia as a basic disorder of symbolization that may exhibit any combination of many aphasic manifestations. These manifestations may be classified as expressive, receptive, associative, mixed.[5]

II

So far, our discussion has dealt with a theory of aphasic disturbance, with a concept of aphasia, with the recognition of aphasic manifestations and with an understanding of the nature of these linguistic aberrations. We have said nothing about what may be done to correct the disorder once we recognize it and have some concept of its nature. The speech pathologist may stop with recognition and comprehension, but the speech correctionist counts these two steps as only a beginning. When he asks himself and his mentors, "Is there a word for aphasia?", he does not mean a word of definition or classification, but an actual, literal word received and/or produced by the individual who has been deprived prenatally, natally or postnatally of the peculiarly human behavior designated by Head as "symbolic formulation"[6] and, earlier, by Jackson as "propositional speech."[7] The problem confronting the speech correctionist is one of prognosis and education or re-education; he begins with the diagnosis, medical, and linguistic.

When an aphasic comes or is brought to a speech clinic, the speech correctionist legitimately may encourage him. For almost every aphasic, there is a word. And once he has a word, he can get more. With the aid of a trained speech therapist, an aphasic patient can reroute his impaired or undeveloped linguistic neurograms. Progress will be slow, but it will also be sure unless there is further pathological invasion of cortical tissue. The aphasic child will learn much less rapidly than the nonaphasic child. The aphasic adult must expect to spend years, not months, if he would regain a part of his former reading, writing, and speaking ability. From one to six years of speech correction may be expected to produce increasingly more efficient comprehension and production of written and oral speech symbols by adults rendered aphasic through injury or illness.

[4] Robert West, Lou Kennedy, and Anna Carr, *The Rehabilitation of Speech* (New York, 1937), p. 121.

[5] Jeanette O. Anderson, "Aphasia from the Viewpoint of a Speech Pathologist," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, IX, 209-226; "Eighteen Cases of Aphasia Studied from the Viewpoint of a Speech Pathologist," *ibid.*, X, 9-33.

[6] Henry Head, *Aphasia and Kindred Disorders of Speech* (New York, 1926), I, 210 ff.

[7] *Selected Writings of J. H. Jackson*, ed. James Taylor (London, 1932), II, 159-160.

After an initial period of training, varying in length from patient to patient, each individual tends to reach a plateau, somewhere short of his former level of excellence, beyond which he seems unable to go despite his will to learn or the extent of the training to which he is exposed. Many persons learn to speak, write, and read enough to carry on uncomplicated lives at home or in simple employment.

Although there is a word for most aphasics, each patient must be ready for his word before it can be taught him and before he can learn it. Neither the aphasic child nor the aphasic adult profits from speech correction until he wants so much to express his inner verbalizations that he spontaneously attempts some form of overt communication with other organisms, human or not, in his environment. This effort to speak may be made orally, manually, grimacingly, graphically, or chirographically. It must be ontogenetic.

Once the aphasic tries to communicate, he will respond to speech training or retraining. During this period of relatively rapid progress, an aphasic child learns well when objects, toys, pictures, and situations are associated with speech sounds. The adult who has through physical or psychological trauma lost all or part of his once-learned ability to manipulate verbal symbols, incoming and outgoing, usually responds better to written or printed symbols than to the realities for which they stand. So completely is the average adult conditioned to living in a word-world that he readjusts to this world more easily and quickly than to the fact-world in which he had his postnatal origin. Only when situations, objects, persons, colors, or pictures are fraught with emotional significance do they provoke an attempt at speech as rapidly as do printed or written symbols. For example, unless an adult patient feels strongly about cats, the printed symbols, *c-a-t*, will probably cause him to respond orally twice as quickly and accurately as a pictured or actual feline . . . on the subhuman level. The same man, however, would be likely to respond more quickly, one way or another, to his wife in person than to the printed symbols, *w-i-f-e*. The former situation would tend to be the stronger stimulus — for better or for worse.

Although it may be necessary at first to employ strongly emotional stimuli to secure overt response from a patient, this practice is to be avoided and discouraged because it leads in the aphasic, even more than in the so-called normal, to noncortical language, to uncontrolled speech, to excesses of emotion that eventually inhibit rather than stimulate volitional speech, to hysteria, to behavior on a thalamic level. Repetition of nonsignificant material; exclamations such as "Oh, fudge!", "Dear me!", "Terrible, terrible!" and "Darn!"; and well phonated and articulated but nonpropositional profanity are examples of speech responses to poorly controlled emotional stimuli. Properly and sparingly used, emotional stimuli may help the patient to recall proper names and may build self-confidence by demonstrating to him that he *can* produce meaningful phonetic combinations.

It is important to guard an aphasic from emotional excesses. He is no longer able to guard himself very effectively. His cortex is damaged, and since the cortex functions as a *Gestalt*, injury to any part of it affects all of its workings. The aphasic's emotional behavior is often as uncontrolled as it was when he was a baby. He laughs and cries easily and without moderation. He has temper-tantrums. He experiences rapid changes in mood. He has to relearn cortical con-

trol not only of speech but of all his overt behavior. In this discussion, however, we are concerned with the psychological and semantic aspects of linguistic impairment rather than with the spastically defective phonation and articulation that often accompany aphasia.

As the infant achieves more and more specialization of activity with the myelinization of cortical fibers, so the aphasic child or adult may be taught increasingly exact behavior patterns. The child, of course, learns speech in half a dozen indiscreet and overlapping stages: undifferentiated crying, differentiated crying, babbling, lallation, echolalia, true speech.[8] The aphasic who is ready for speech training is usually babbling. Lallation and echolalia should be employed as useful steps leading toward true speech. Phonetics and the incorporation of speech sounds into nonsense syllables seem useful only as they are made an integral part of the normal speech learning process just described. In and of themselves, they seem nonvaluable; used in a developmental learning sequence, they may be invaluable.

III

In helping an aphasic patient toward a volitional use of language, it is useful to know that there are more ways than one to approach the teaching of speech. When we learn new words, we more or less consciously employ one or more of these ways in stimulating ourselves to produce speech in audible or visible form. Those of us who are eye minded depend mainly upon visual imagery; we count on being able to see the word in our mind's eye whenever we need to reproduce it in writing or speech. We learn by seeing and reseeing. Others of us are ear minded. We are able to reproduce language orally and in writing — we are usually better speakers than spellers — because of re-auditorization or hearing in our mind's ear. We depend chiefly upon auditory imagery. We learn by hearing and rehearing. Still others among us are movement minded. We learn by repetition of neuro muscular patterns. We say or write a word over and over again to learn it. When we want to reproduce it at a later date, we depend upon kinesthetic imagery, upon a sense of re-moving. Visual, auditory and kinesthetic imagery account for most speech learning. For certain words we depend to a lesser degree upon tactile, olfactory, and gustatory images as well. Most of us use all of these images in combination as we learn, but one type of imagery usually predominates or leads.

We learn, retain, and reproduce symbols because we are able to summon images at will. The aphasic can usually learn or relearn along the same pattern, but more slowly. At first, the speech correctionist needs to present as many stimuli as possible with each word to be learned; later, the strongest or lead stimulus will become evident and can then be employed as an initial stimulus for further learning. It is always more effective, however, to use a combination of stimuli than to depend upon any one alone. The aphasic will speak and/or write a word more quickly if he hears it *and* sees it while he tries to write it *and* say it than if only one stimulus were presented and only one response requested. There are at least two reasons for this: first, each stimulus and response tends to reinforce others made simultaneously; second, if one avenue of reception or expression is blocked, anatomically or psychologically, concomitant stimuli and responses provide alternate routes by which necessary neurological associations may be effected.

[8] Mildred F. Berry and Jon Eisenson *The Defective in Speech* (New York, 1942), chap. I.

To effect these associations, neural impulses must be rerouted to their usual association areas through healthy tissue; remaining tissue of the dominant hemisphere must associate impulses previously synapsing elsewhere; or the intact, usually nondominant, cerebral hemisphere must take over the function of damaged brain areas. This is the theory upon which neurologists and psychologists explain restitution of linguistic function. Such restitution occurs slowly, only partially spontaneously and never *in vacuo*. We have noted that the cerebral cortex functions as a unit. This is true of the entire central nervous system. This nervous system, we know, is capable of extreme selectivity and specificity, but it is also true that interference with the functioning of any part of the system is reflected throughout the system and its activities. For us, this means that we never work with aphasia but always with the aphasic individual. Speech is, even more truly than style, the expression of an individual's mode of experience. In teaching aphasic children, speech ought to be an outgrowth of daily experience. Speech should never be taught as an entity, an end in itself, but always as an integral part of the business of living, a means to an end. For the aphasic adult, retraining in speech cannot be separated from emotional, social, and vocational retraining. Only as a patient achieves personal, social, and economic stability will his speech stabilize. He cannot be taught speech while he waits to live. He has to go on living and his speech training will be useful to him only as it keeps pace with his needs.

If speech therapy for aphasic children and adults is planned to satisfy the special, biological, social, and economic needs of each patient, there *is* a word for aphasics.

In brief recapitulation, then there is a word for aphasics: (1) if there is no progressive destruction of brain tissue, and speech training will not interfere with the patient's recovery; (2) if there is no previous history of inability to learn language for other reasons than the aphasia; (3) if the patient has attempted spontaneously to communicate; (4) if regular daily speech training is adapted to each patient's special abilities and linguistic residues and incorporated into his way of life.

FIELD AND SHIPBOARD TRAINING OF BATTLE TELEPHONE TALKERS*

LOUIS A. MALLORY
Assistant Professor of Speech, Brooklyn College, New York
and
JOHN C. SNIDECOR
Associate Professor of Speech, Univ. of Calif., Santa Barbara College

WHEN early in 1943 Project N-109 was organized at the request of the U. S. Navy "to develop tests, devices, and methods for the selection and training of personnel for speech communication over battle telephone equipment," no systematic, co-ordinated, overall training program for interior voice communications had been organized. The Navy was keenly aware of the importance of effective communication over the sound-powered battle phones, but the training of talkers had heretofore been left largely to the discretion of individual training officers and ship commanders. Wartime experience indicated the need for a more standardized and more integrated training program. The large number of men being inducted into the naval service and assigned to sea duty as quickly as possible after their basic training also made the immediate introduction of talker training at the boot camp level of considerable importance. As indicated in the first article of this series, much of the telephone talking aboard ship is done by relatively inexperienced men. Yet the reports and commands they are required to relay are frequently of vital importance to the operation of the ship. Under peacetime conditions there was more time in which a man could learn to become effective as a talker along with his other duties. Under the stress of war an ineffective talker might at any time become a danger spot on his ship. Operation and combat reports indicated frequent failures in interior communications, sometimes with disastrous results.

As soon, therefore, as sufficient research had been completed to warrant reasonably sound conclusions concerning effective training methods,[1] the results were communicated to the Navy, and as quickly as possible talker training programs were established in the field and on shipboard.

Talker Training at the Boot Camp Level

Basic, or boot camp, training was given by the Navy at a number of training centers, under various conditions, and with varying schedules. One of the first facts encountered in the field training of telephone talkers was that the courses needed to be flexible enough to meet differing conditions of time allotment and instructional personnel available. The *U. S. Fleet Telephone Talkers' Manual*, developed by Project N-109, in collaboration with various naval agencies, provided the basic information

* This is the second of two articles based on the research and service programs of Project N-109, Office of Scientific Research and Development, Applied Psychology Panel, The Psychological Corporation, New York City, contractor. The first article summarized the research undertaken to determine suitable methods for the selection and training of naval battle telephone talkers. This article will sketch some of the training programs as applied in the field and on shipboard. Project personnel most active in these training programs were: George K. Bennett, George W. Hibbitt, William J. Temple, John C. Snidecor (later with the Navy), and Louis A. Mallory. Personnel of collaborating projects will be indicated under the appropriate section.

[1] See the first article of this series for a summary of this research.

necessary for effective communication over sound-powered telephone circuits, but it did not provide course outlines, drill materials, or exercises. When, therefore, the Destroyer Escort Gunnery School, Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Virginia, requested material for special drills for 3″ and 5″ guns, preparation of this requested material developed into the *Supplement to Fleet Telephone Talkers' Manual, I: A Guide for the Training of Instructors with Methods of Instruction for Telephone Talkers.*[2] This *Supplement,* in addition to a plan for a telephone talker classroom and suggestions for shipboard training, contained lesson plans for a four-hour, a three-hour, and a briefer talker course, together with practice materials in special digit drill, language used in docking and paravaning, language used in damage control, gunnery drills for 3″/50, and 5″/38, and 1.175 guns, phrasing commands, and drill on difficult sounds. Distributed by the Navy to the various training centers, the *Supplement* became the basis of the telephone talker courses at various levels.

As equipment for basic talker training a classroom for 30 to 50 men was recommended, with from 15 to 25 sound-powered phones arranged in two banks in celotex booths, open on one side, and two completely enclosed celotex booths with observation windows for two instructors. A phonograph play-back was also recommended, together with two magnetic tape recorders suggested as desirable but not essential additional equipment.

The course content suggested consisted of: (1) "The Importance of Battle Phone Talking" (dramatic training phonograph recording); (2) "How to Speak over Battle Phones" (a similar recording); (3) "Mass Drill" for speech training; (4) reading of *Fleet Telephone Talkers' Manual;* (5) "Standard Battle Phone Procedures and Commands" (dramatic training recording); (6) demonstration of phone make-up and stowage; (7) drill on phones; (8) digit drill on phones; (9) appropriate gun circuit drills on phones; (10) drill on phones in phraseology in docking or streaming paravance; (11) drill on phones in phrasing commands.

Objective quizzes on the material of the *Talkers' Manual* and the three training records were provided, and a performance check on the men's handling of the equipment was recommended.

A four-hour course was recommended as the desirable minimum standard, and a five-hour course was later made standard by the Training Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel. After an excellent training motion picture had been developed by the Training Division, its use was recommended.

Voice Communications Program for the Submarine Service

In April, 1944, the Columbia University Division of War Research laboratory at New London, Connecticut, was asked by the Commander, Submarines, Atlantic, to assist in standardizing submarine voice procedures and phraseology, and in developing a comprehensive voice communications training program. As a result of this request, a co-operative program was developed, with personnel from the Harvard Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory, Columbia University Division of War Research, and Project N-109 participating.[3] A training program providing for basic, intermediate, and ad-

[2] The complete Supplement is contained in OSRD Report No. 3671, June, 1944.

[3] Personnel from the Harvard Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory most actively concerned with this work were: M. H. Abrams, J. Miller, and E. B. Newman. For Columbia University Division of War Research: W. D. Neff, W. L. Jenkins, and T. K. Glennan.

vanced courses was developed, put into operation at New London, and, subsequently, extended to other submarine bases. A feature of the field training at New London was the training of five naval officers appointed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel to take charge of training activities at outlying centers. Later, twenty-one enlisted men were trained and assigned to staff the training installations at various submarine activities.

Motivation was an important factor in all field training of talkers. It was at times hard to convince either officers or men, concerned as they were with the more spectacular aspects of naval training, that drill in speaking over telephones was necessary. It was felt that this problem of motivation would be particularly important with the crews of submarines, as many of the men undergoing training had already been on patrol or had seen service with the surface fleet. Such men were apt to feel that they had little need for training in talking over the battle phones.

Partly to meet this factor of motivation, training equipment somewhat more elaborate than that recommended for the basic course for surface talkers was developed. A training interphone, developed earlier by the Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory for other work, was modified for use in the submarine training program. This training interphone provided a two-channel amplifier, a noise generator, a VU meter for measuring the level of speech or noise, and a filter for distorting speech over the loud-speaker system in a manner similar to that in which it is distorted by sound-powered phones.

A specially designed control desk placed all the equipment used in running the drills within easy reach of the chief instructor. Loud-speakers were suspended overhead in the classroom to broadcast interfering noise during drills. In addition to the sound-powered phones, an intercom system was provided to simulate the 1MC and 7MC announcing systems on board a submarine. Recording equipment and a phonograph play-back were also provided.

Each training room was designed to operate two 15-phone circuits at the same time. Drills were conducted against a background of submarine noise similar in quality and intensity to that prevailing in the engine rooms with both diesels running.

With this equipment the instructor was able not only to demonstrate the transmission characteristics of sound-powered phones and the effect of interfering noise upon intelligibility, but he was also able to vary the difficulty of the drills according to the skill of the students. The ambient interfering noise also drowned out the sound of voices in the room, so that the messages transmitted could be heard only over the phones. The recording and playback equipment made it possible for a trainee to hear himself in relation to the other men on the circuit. Weak or poorly articulated transmissions were thus very effectively demonstrated, and improvement could be objectively noted.

The basic course provided for at least five hours of instruction. In the first hour the instructor, using the interphone trainer and loud-speakers, described and demonstrated the reasons behind seven rules for good telephone talking. These rules, simplified conclusions drawn from research and observation, were prominently displayed on posters in the training room. They were as follows: (1) Press the transmitter button only when transmitting. (2) Keep the transmitter close to the lips. (3) Talk loudly, but do not shout. (4) Pronounce clearly. (5) Talk

slowly. (6) Use only standard phraseology. (7) Maintain circuit discipline.

The effect of breaking each rule was demonstrated over the equipment, and the reason for the rule, in terms of the characteristics of the equipment and the conditions under which it had to be used, were explained. Rule 7 was demonstrated by a recording made from a submarine's communications circuits under actual operations. The faults and their results were analyzed and correct circuit discipline and procedure were demonstrated in a simulated situation.

The remaining four hours of the basic course provided intensive drills on the telephone circuits, together with practice in handling the equipment.

The intermediate course gave instruction in the particular phraseology associated with each type of assignment aboard a submarine.

The advanced course, consisting of three parts, (1) training room period, (2) training device and dock-side training, and (3) underway training, was the combat team stage of training in interior communications, given after a crew had been assigned to a specific submarine.[4]

Talker Training for Advanced Units

Ideally, all men assigned to shipboard duty should have had the basic battle telephone training. Under practical field conditions this was frequently not the case. It became desirable, therefore, to introduce talker training at precommissioning training centers, where crews assigned to specific ships were given additional training while waiting for their ship to be commissioned. Experience also indicated the desirability of talker training at advanced bases at which ships put in for supplies, at shakedown training centers, and, in many cases, on ships after they had passed the shakedown period.

Early in the program at New London it was observed that much of the ultimate effect of shore talker training was determined by the attitude of ship's officers and petty officers toward the necessity and importance of that training and toward the principles and techniques taught in the shore schools. Unless the standards taught on shore were also required on board ship, and unless there was close co-ordination between what was taught in the classroom with the examples seen and heard in actual practice, the effect of the shore training soon became negligible. Because of the important part officers play in setting standards and in furnishing examples of the type of performance required, it was evident that a chief problem in making the talker training program practically effective was the proper indoctrination of ship's officers. These observations, constantly reinforced by subsequent experience, led to the development of talker training courses for officers. It was interesting from a speech point of view that the higher educational level and wider social experience of officers did not at all insure adequate speech over the sound-powered telephone under the adverse conditions typically encountered on board ship. The purpose of officer talker courses was not, however, primarily to make good talkers out of the officer, but, rather, to make him fully aware of the problems his talkers would meet and what, consequently, could and could not be expected of them.

The content of these courses at advanced units varied somewhat with special conditions, but it was usually found necessary to repeat the material

[4] Full details of this program are reported in: *Project for Standardizing Submarine Phraseology and Developing a Training Program in Submarine Voice Communications, OSRD Report No. 4795* (Restricted).

of the basic course. It was found that even considerable experience with the battle phones at sea was no assurance that a man was a good talker. Faulty techniques in handling the phones and in speaking over them were almost as common with experienced men as with inexperienced recruits.

The advanced elements of these courses consisted chiefly in drill on the phraseology used in specialized activities, such as gunnery, reports of lookouts, damage control, etc. Emphasis was also placed on the proper phrasing of commands, a greater knowledge of the ship's communication circuits and the use of each circuit in typical operations, and in the reasons lying behind the necessity for a special technique in handling the phones and in speaking over them. As equipment became available more and more of the training centers utilized the training advantage of realistic interfering noise and recording devices.

Courses for Telephone Talker Instructions

As the program of training for battle telephone talkers developed, the need for trained instructional personnel increased. Schools for talker instructors were established by the Navy at various points, Philadelphia, New London, San Diego, and San Francisco, among others. Course content, equipment, instructional methods, and duration of instruction were not entirely uniform at these various schools, but basically the work done presented an integrated program conducive to standardizing efficient methods of talker instruction throughout the various training commands.

Shipboard Training of Talkers

In order to bridge the gap between talker training ashore and actual battle phone talking at sea, recommendations were made that each ship appoint an interior communications officer to be responsible for the quality of interior communications on his ship. It was suggested that whenever possible the ship's talker officer should observe the training of his men on shore in order to know his strong and his weak talkers and in order to be prepared to organize the most effective form of shipboard training if additional training were required. Many ships followed these recommendations and conducted extensive telephone talker training under the direction of the interior communications officer.

One of the most extensive afloat talker training programs was conducted by the San Diego Shakedown Group. This organization established an Interior Communications Department whose authorized complement by the end of June, 1945, consisted of seven officers and five enlisted men.

When a ship arrived for shakedown, an "arrival inspection" was given to determine the state of training of the officers and enlisted talkers, and the material condition of circuits, telephones, and stowage facilities. The percentage of talkers (officers and men) who had taken advantage of the shore-based training was determined. If no suitable training program was in effect for the ship's company, one was suggested to the telephone talker officer of the ship. Assistance was rendered in the procurement of training aids and materials.

An officer from the Interior Communications Department then went aboard the ship as an underway instructor for several days at the beginning of the shakedown training and again for several days near the end of the shakedown period. He taught the proper method of making up and stowing the telephones, and standard circuit procedures to

groups of talkers. He also monitored and recorded active circuits during scheduled exercises and then played the recordings back to the officers and men involved, pointing out and correcting errors during the play-back. He urged the selection of the best qualified talker on each circuit for the control station of the circuit and suggested making him responsible for circuit dicipline and the use of standard procedures. He also recommended that the officers be included in the talker training program, and that they be trained in the use of standard commands and ship's language in originating commands and messages.

The final exercise for ships undergoing shakedown training consisted of a battle problem. During this battle problem officers of the Interior Communications Department of the Shakedown Group monitored and recorded the traffic on the most important battle telephone circuits. The recordings were played back to the officers, and, if possible, to the talkers themselves. At the critique which was held after the conclusion of the battle problem, the head of Interior Communications made a report on the telephone talking, pointing out the good points and the deficiencies observed, and suggesting ways and means to improve use of the ship's interior communications equipment. Transcriptions of the battle problem recordings were made and sent to the ship for use in further training.

Summary

The program for field and shipboard training of battle telephone talkers was a practical program growing out of the necessities of our surface and submarine fleets during the war. An effort was made to put the results of research and trained observation into use as quickly as possible by methods lending themselves readily to mass instruction by relatively non-specialized instructional personnel. Speech elements as such were reduced to the lowest practicable minimum and were taught as part of a general operational technique. Training gave a minimum of theory and a maximum of realistic drill. Simplification and repetition were devices constantly employed. Auditory and visual training aides were utilized as soon as their worth had been established. Experience indicated that even short periods of training under relatively adverse conditions of instruction materially improved the intelligibility of battle telephone talkers.[5]

[5] Training programs sketched in this article are more fully described in *Final Report in Summary of Work on the Selection and Training of Telephone Talkers. OSRD Report No. 5497. August 27, 1945.* (Restricted)

The opinions stated in this article are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent those of the Navy Department.

SPEECH NEEDS OF TEACHERS

HEROLD LILLYWHITE
College of the Pacific

ON the assumption that the large majority of speech programs in teacher-training institutions are the result of the special interests, hobbies, and biases of individual speech instructors, and that there is a lack of information on the part of college curriculum makers, a study was undertaken at New York University in the spring of 1943 to attempt to determine the real speech needs of teachers in the field and of prospective teachers in the teachers colleges of Minnesota. Although the study was confined to one state and to the graduates and prospective graduates of teachers colleges in that state, the findings seem to be significant to speech education in other states and to all institutions training teachers.

I

The investigation involved two separate processes: (1) The securing of information, by questionnaire, from administrators and teachers in Minnesota elementary and high school systems; (2) the analysis, by five experienced teachers of speech, of the recorded speech of 100 prospective teachers in three of the Minnesota teachers colleges. Replies were received from 161 school superintendents, 35 principals, 185 elementary teachers, 112 high school English teachers, and 137 other high school teachers, making a total of 630 teachers and administrators who contributed valuable information based upon actual experience with conditions in the field. The 630 replies, added to the detailed analysis of the recordings of 100 prospective teachers, provide substantial evidence for conclusions and recommendations concerning the speech needs of teachers in Minnesota schools.

A surprising number of interesting and significant facts concerning the actual conditions with respect to speech training, or lack of it, and speech needs in the elementary and high schools of the State were secured from the study, but space will not allow for presentation of any but the final major conclusions and recommendations based on the investigation.

II

Six distinct speech needs seem to be suggested by the data as follows:

1. A need for some speech preparation for all teachers, to include (a) general basic instruction in speech, (b) instruction in the principles and methods of speech correction, and (c) remedial speech where needed.
2. A need for formal speech preparation and extracurricular speech experience for English teachers, to include all of the speech preparation indicated above, additional speech preparation amounting to approximately a speech minor (about 24 quarter hours), and a minimum amount of required participation in extracurricular speech.
3. A need for a speech major to be offered in some or all of the teachers colleges and a need for a speech minor in all of them.
4. A need for a speech test as part of the college entrance requirements for all students.
5. A need for summer school and in-service speech programs for teachers in the field.
6. A need for a program to acquaint administrators with the nature of speech

education and its relation to their schools.

III

The six needs listed above are substantiated by the following data. Thirty-two per cent of all the teachers answering the questionnaire had had no speech preparation. Twenty-nine per cent of the teachers indicated that their speech preparation had not equipped them with speech adequate to meet the demands of teaching. Sixty-one per cent of the administrators indicated that some teachers fail to secure positions because of inadequate speech. Seventy-eight per cent of the administrators and 94 per cent of the teachers indicated that all teachers should have some speech preparation. The former recommended a median of 8 semester hours and the latter recommended a median of 8.3 semester hours. Sixty-two per cent of the administrators required "habitual use of good speech" of applicants who succeed in securing positions with them. Administrators and teachers ranked speech proficiency between second and third (on a five-point scale) in importance to other factors considered in the application for a position in teaching. Approximately 40 per cent of the administrators indicated that there are teachers in their schools with inadequate speech.

Public speaking, speech fundamentals, and dramatics are the courses that have been most beneficial to the teachers; administrators and teachers recommend public speaking, fundamentals, and voice and diction most often as beneficial courses for all teachers; administrators see the need for the teacher to be free from grammatical errors and mispronunciations, speech defects, and affectation, to possess poise and sincerity, and voices that are audible and distinct. (These factors were chosen most often from among several others most commonly used.)

Seventy-three per cent of the administrators and 88 per cent of the teachers are aware of some speech defects among their students, yet there exists no organized correction program in the large majority of schools. Only 36 special speech correction teachers are at present employed in Minnesota public schools (1943); therefore, the correction problem must be met by regular classroom teachers in almost all cases. Ninety-two per cent of the teachers listed some classroom activity designed to improve the speech of their pupils, and more than 77 per cent said they would attempt to do more speech improvement work if they had more preparation in speech correction; this indicates that the course or courses taken did not provide this preparation. Elementary teachers especially seem to feel the need for speech correction preparation, as they recommend it more often than do other teachers, and more of them indicated their own needs for more preparation in speech correction. The correction course was among the courses most frequently recommended by administrators and teachers for all teachers.

The fact that both administrators and teachers so often listed freedom from speech defects as one of the essential qualifications of the teacher (this aspect ranked second to freedom from grammatical errors and mispronunciations in all cases) and the fact that extensive surveys in other states and schools indicate that a minimum of 30 to 40 per cent of college freshmen have speech defects,[1] are strong evidence of the ne-

[1] E. C. Mabie in "Speech Training and Individual Needs," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XIX (1933), 344, indicates that more than 50 per cent have defective speech; B. C. Van Wye, "The Efficient Voice in Speech," *ibid.* XXII (1946), 647, suggests 52 per cent; Letitia Raubicheck, *How to Teach Good Speech in Elementary*

cessity for remedial speech work beyond the regular speech courses in college.

Almost 50 per cent of the administrators indicated that they thought the English teacher should have some speech preparation in order to teach the oral work connected with regular English classes. Eighty per cent of the English teachers spend some time in regular English classes on oral exercises designed to improve the speech of students. English teachers recommend more than a speech minor for the teacher who is to teach speech (a median of 25.1 semester hours), and approximately a speech minor (a median of 15.5 semester hours) for themselves. Fifteen per cent of the English teachers had had no speech preparation and of those who had taken speech courses the average was 2.7 courses each. They recommend considerably more speech preparation for themselves than they have had. Thirty-six per cent of the high schools represented in the study offered speech courses; these courses were taught by English teachers in slightly less than 45 per cent of the schools. Thirty-eight per cent of the English teachers reported extracurricular speech activities.

The need for a speech major to be offered in the teachers colleges is suggested by the fact that 36 per cent of the high schools represented in this survey have speech courses. (This is probably a minimum percentage because the 1942 Minnesota Speech Association survey shows that 52 per cent of the state high schools offered speech courses.) More than 45 per cent of the administrators require a teacher who has a major in speech to teach the speech courses, and most of the others require a teacher who has had speech preparation amounting to a speech minor or more, but more than 57 per cent indicated that the speech courses are taught by teachers who have a speech major. Fifty-one per cent of the administrators and 54 per cent of the English teachers indicated that there is sufficient need in their schools to justify the hiring of one or more teachers with a speech major.

On the basis of the obviously low estimate of the 8 per cent of speech defects that classroom teachers indicated existed among their students, and because very little is done to correct these defects by the time the student leaves high school, an entrance test in speech for students entering the colleges of Minnesota seems to be partially justified. If we accept the minimum of 30 to 40 per cent of speech defectives among college freshmen in the country as a whole (see footnote 1 above), there is considerably more justification for a speech test at college entrance.

There is considerable evidence in the questionnaire replies to indicate that many administrators are confused as to just what speech as an academic subject means, what speech education involves, and the role speech plays in the schools. There seems to be a rather widespread misconception that the person who has a major in English has automatically acquired sufficient speech preparation to suffice for any and all speech teaching or direction of extracurricular speech. Forty-six per cent of the administrators indicated that they thought English majors needed no speech preparation for ordinary teaching of English classes; 35 per cent thought that the English teacher is qualified to direct extracurricular

Schools (1937), p. 8, suggests 91 per cent; Elwood Murray, *The Speech Personality* (1937), p. 4, suggests 50 per cent; J. F. Bender, *Speech in College Life* (1939), pp. 32, 33, suggests 35 per cent; W. A. Cable, *Cultural and Scientific Speech* (1930), p. 81 (quoting W. F. Orr), suggests 41 per cent; R. Bedell and M. Ponge, *Educational Administration and Supervision* (1941), p. 153, suggests 32 per cent. All of these percentages are based on separate surveys.

speech with no speech preparation, and 8 per cent thought that the English teacher is qualified to teach speech with no speech preparation. Administrators found a median of only 2.4 per cent of their students with speech defects. Seventy-eight per cent of the administrators who indicated that there are students with defective speech in their schools stated that there was not sufficient need for teachers with speech majors on their staffs.

IV.

Analysis of the recordings showed a combined total of 4417 speech faults found by all the raters on all the recordings, or an average of 8.8 mistakes on each recording. (The length of recordings averaged about two minutes.) The general rating of all factors, showing more than 65 per cent of the recordings rated as "poor," and 30 per cent rated as "fair," probably means that 95 per cent of the prospective teachers whose recordings were analyzed used speech that was considered inadequate for teaching. (This estimate is based on the standards of speech set up in the New York City speech examination for teachers.[2] The conclusions above need not necessarily apply to Minnesota, but such a procedure does offer a standard of comparison.)

Seventy per cent of the recordings showed the mispronunciation of the vowel sound *a* (as in cat); more than 30 per cent showed the mispronunciation of two other vowel sounds, and 7 additional vowel sounds were mispronounced by more than 10 per cent of the students recorded. More than 60 per cent of the recordings showed the faults of inversion and nasality, and more than 25 per cent showed all of the additional faults as follows: faulty phrasing, faulty emphasis, faulty articulation, tenseness, rate, and faulty inflection; more than 15 per cent showed faults of lisping, indistinctness, and fractured vowels. Eighty per cent of all of the faults of general speech characteristics were considered either "serious" or "very serious," but 49 per cent of the recordings showing nasality were considered "very serious." Thus analysis of the recording seems to indicate especially the need for corrective speech work in the colleges and for a thorough speech examination at college entrance.

V.

On the basis of the needs as discovered in this study the following recommendations are made for the planning of speech programs in the teacher-training institutions of Minnesota, (and for planning programs in other states where the conditions warrant):

1. The speech curricula should be based on a speech-testing program that will determine the nature and extent of speech defects of incoming freshmen as a group and as individuals, and that will eliminate students with irremediable speech defects from the teacher-training curricula. This speech test might preferably be made a part of the entrance requirements for all students, but in any event it ought to be given to prospective teachers.
2. After students and examiners learn the extent and nature of individual speech defects the student should be required to take remedial speech work until his speech is considered adequate for teaching.
3. The previous recommendation implies the establishment and maintenance of an extensive speech correction program whereby students may receive in-

[2] This examination was familiar to all the raters, so the speech standards set up in it were used as a basis for the recording analysis. For a discussion and analysis of the New York City Speech examination see R. C. Pennington, *Speech in the Teaching Profession* (1939), Columbia University Publications.

dividual help with their speech problems. Ideally this would probably be in the nature of a speech correction clinic operated separate from but in close cooperation with all other speech courses and activities.

4. It seems evident that a minimum of two different speech courses should be required of all prospective teachers. The first of these courses would include basic work in speech and general speech preparation. The evidence seems to show that the aspects of voice, diction, poise, distinctness, audibility, and sincerity should receive attention, as well as instruction designed to free the student from grammatical errors, mispronunciations, and affectations. It is probable that a foundation in elementary phonetics and attention to minor speech defects should be the basis for this course. It would seem that an eight quarter hour course would be best suited to cover this training, but a minimum of four quarter hours would seem essential.

The second required course for all students would be one in the principles and methods of speech correction designed to give every prospective teacher the knowledge and techniques necessary for the recognition, diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of the minor speech defects in children. A minimum of four quarter hours would be required in order to give adequate attention to this course; it should probably be given in the sophomore year in order to reach all elementary teachers in those schools still granting the elementary teaching certificate at the end of the second year. Both required courses would have to be completed in the first two years for the same reason.

5. The data seem to suggest that students preparing for high school teaching might well take a third speech course: public speaking and discussion. Preferably this course would be required but if not required, it should be strongly recommended.

6. In addition to the two required courses outlined above, there seems to be justification for recommending that English majors be required to complete minors in speech. This minor would necessarily include public speaking and related activities, dramatics, interpretation, and advanced work in phonetics and speech correction.

7. All students should be urged to engage in at least one extracurricular speech activity, and students with majors in English should be required to have a minimum amount of extracurricular speech experience. The amount of the requirement cannot be determined from the study; it would probably be determined by the individual college program.

8. Colleges might well give serious consideration to the establishment of a definite program of summer school and in-service speech preparation for teachers in the field. This program should give first consideration to the two required courses for all teachers, but should allow for considerable variation in order to meet individual needs and demands.

9. It is recognized that the fulfillment of such a program as recommended would require considerably more teaching personnel than the college speech staffs now employ. The enlargement of these staffs is earnestly recommended, but until more speech teachers are available in the colleges it will be possible to gain great assistance, and at the same time give valuable preparation to those students involved, by making use of advanced students, who have had considerable speech instruction, to assist in speech clinic work and in the direction of extracurricular speech activities.

10. Since the speech problems seem so well distributed throughout the state and in the different colleges, and since the situations within the colleges are somewhat similar, it would seem advantageous for all the colleges to work together in an attempt to establish speech curricula that are somewhat similar in aim, scope, and content.

11. Colleges should give serious consideration to the matter of offering majors and minors in speech where this is not already done. (Only one of the six teachers colleges in Minnesota offers a major and only two a minor.)

The study showed quite conclusively that the Minnesota teacher-training institutions, teachers colleges in particular, but many private schools as well, are only partially meeting a few of the evident speech needs. Many of these needs are not being met at all. On the whole, the speech programs in Minnesota colleges are far from adequate at present, but they are well in advance of the programs in many other states. Several states, however, have speech programs that seem much more adequate than those in Minnesota.

The investigation further indicated definite interest in the speech problems of the schools on the part of administrators and teachers. The response was excellent and cooperation unexpectedly good. The time seems ripe for the establishment of a really effective speech program in Minnesota and in many other states as well—a program that will meet the demonstrated needs as shown by prospective teachers, by teachers in the field, and by administrators.

IMPROVING THE FUNDAMENTALS COURSE

D. P. McKELVEY
Stanford University

IN this article I propose to make a few observations about fundamentals courses, to describe a particular situation, and to indicate briefly how a series of related problems were handled. Although a specific situation will be used for illustrative purposes, I believe it holds implications for comparable situations.

I

Nearly four years ago I had occasion to survey the opinions of a sizable group of mature individuals who had received their Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree from two to twelve years previously. Free responses were gathered regarding the reactions of this group to their undergraduate training in speech. Frequently individuals commented upon weaknesses in their training in connection with *fundamentals* courses. Such statements as the following were received:

> Needless repetition of material in courses.
>
> Lack of integration toward a common end.
>
> Haphazard, just dabbling . . . another waste.
>
> Too many graduate instructors of poor quality swelled with their teaching importance.
>
> Lectures lacked subject matter, were not examples of good delivery.
>
> The teachers seemed bored with such elementary work.
>
> The instructor felt it necessary to deluge the class with a smattering of knowledge, uncoordinated facts superficially presented.

A good many students and instructors from other institutions with whom I

have talked are generally critical of the fundamentals sequence. In general, the chief points of contention seem to be:

(1) There is insufficient integration of the work toward a common end.

(2) There is too much overlapping among beginning courses.

(3) Instructors are bored with elementary work.

(4) Courses are often poorly organized and taught by inexperienced people.

(5) There is inadequate provision made for students who, prior to matriculation, have mastered skills or subject matter content covered in beginning courses.

Some of the persons I have talked with suggested that one of the possible causes for such weaknesses is to be found in the tendency of departments to put more time and care into advanced courses than into beginning courses. I have been reminded that in departments where considerable attention is devoted to graduate training frequently the practice has been to use graduate students generously in teaching the beginning courses. Some institutions seem to have operated on the theory that completion of a certain amount of graduate work *automatically* qualifies one to teach beginning work. Efforts to overcome the obvious weakness of such a theory have been made through various plans for supervision of graduate students used for instructional purposes. Such supervision tends to be inadequate, however, when those entrusted with the job must be preoccupied with other interests and activities. And in an academic situation where more lucrative recognition results from the expenditure of energies in other directions, it is easy for the supervisor to be too preoccupied to devote sufficient time to the fundamentals courses.

II

I believe I am correct in saying that a few years ago at Stanford we had a situation in the fundamentals courses which embodied many of the weaknesses to which I have already alluded. We had little or no integration of the work toward a common end. There was some overlapping and inadequate provision for handling students who had previously mastered skills or subject matter covered in the courses. Graduate students were used generously to teach the courses. To complicate the situation, for a time we had three people with divergent points of view in charge of directing the work of the four courses that make up our fundamentals sequence.

During the war we began to ready our house for the present postwar boom. The executive head appointed an advisory committee. This committee, among other things, recommended the appointment of a single individual to serve as coordinator for the fundamentals course sequence. The understanding was that the coordinator was to assume leadership for the direction and integration of the work in the four courses, with assurance of strong executive backing, adequate time allowance for carrying on the work, and appropriate university recognition. The four courses were to be detached from the divisions of public speaking, interpretation, and speech reeducation. It was hoped that in time these courses would become a well organized, unified whole.

As a result of a study made of 173 sections of the four fundamentals courses, covering a period of four years, it was found that out of a total of twenty-two members of the teaching staff who had handled these sections only one person during the entire four years had handled sections in all of the basic courses and that a majority of the people

had handled sections in only one of the courses. We discovered, also, that two-thirds of the people handling these courses held the rank of acting instructor or teaching assistant, that over half of the sections had been handled by "transients," and that in the first course 60 per cent of the students had been taught by teaching assistants.

An analysis of teaching costs covering the same period revealed a great range in the amount we were spending per student for instructional costs. We found that in some instances we were spending as little as $3 per student, whereas in other instances we were spending as much as $39 per student per quarter. In spite of the great range in teaching costs, we found that the maximum expenditure per student in the fundamentals courses was less than the average expenditure per student in all other department courses. Although nearly 50 per cent of the total students enrolled in the department were to be found in these four fundamentals courses, they were receiving but 20 per cent of the total instructional budget for the department.

As a result of this study it became apparent that a major problem for the new coordinator would be to allocate available funds in such a way that all students would receive some instruction from thirty-nine-dollar people and would be turned over to three-dollar people only for that part of the work three-dollar people can do well.

A description of the method which has been developed for handling our beginning course will indicate the ways in which we have attempted to meet some of the criticisms of fundamentals courses. In the first term we concentrate on the development of adequate vocal skill with emphasis on clear enunciation, proper breathing, suitable diction, adequate projection, pleasant quality, effective variety, a becoming pitch level, etc. Students in all sections meet jointly twice a week for lectures and group drill. These joint meetings are handled by the more mature members of the teaching staff who in turn are aided, in connection with certain parts of the work, by other specialists, some from within the department and some from outside of the department. These lecture demonstrations are presented in such a fashion as to tie in with textbook materials. For example, each term a member of our physics department presents a lecture demonstration on the physics of sound as related to speech. In preparation for this assignment this faculty member first familiarized himself with the textbook and then spent several weeks of time in assembling materials and in building special equipment —resonators, filters, etc. A member of our anatomy department has done a similar job for us on the subject of the vocal mechanism and vocal hygiene, while the director of our clinic has prepared materials centering on the topics of vocal quality and the importance of vibrato in the speaking voice.

In addition to meeting jointly in these large lecture periods, students meet twice a week in small sections for additional drill and for individual performance in simple reading-speaking situations. Finally, each student has a conference once a week for individual help and for a check-up on his attainment of some aspect of oral skill. These section meetings and conferences are handled by the junior members of the staff who, in turn, are working under the close direction of a senior staff member.

Today we are making increased use of auditory and visual aids. We have also developed attainment examinations for the various basic courses which may

be taken by any student. If a student passes an attainment examination, he is automatically excused from the course which it covers and may proceed immediately to a more advanced course. We have tried, moreover, to tie down our objectives and to agree on procedures. It is our belief that all students who complete a given basic course, regardless of the section they happen to be in, should have made a contact with similar subject matter areas and should have completed a similar series of oral activities. We have tried to standardize, not regiment, the work. Our aim is to maintain a high degree of stability, continuity, and excellence of instruction while providing for a maximum of individual freedom to the instructor in accomplishing desired ends.

At present our fundamentals courses center on voice training, which in turn is aimed at the development of adequate vocal skill in reading, speaking, and conversational situations. After one or two quarters of work in basic voice training, the amount of work depending on the needs of the individual, the student may go on to a course in oral reading where attention is concentrated on conveying the intellectual and emotional content of the page *with the aid of an effective voice*. Finally, he may go on to an experience which centers attention on organizing ideas in speech form and in presenting them to a group, *with the aid of an effective vocal mechanism*.

III

As I have already indicated, this fundamentals sequence has as its core, voice training. Although this approach has been satisfactory for us and we believe it to be sound, I am not suggesting a general reorganization of fundamentals sequences around voice training. I am fully aware that there are other approaches which have merit. Instead, I would suggest that in case you have not done so already, it is time to take inventory of your courses and then muster courage to make the necessary adjustments so as to put your house, on the fundamentals level, in order.

I believe it is possible to provide a strong, integrated sequence, a sequence which makes adequate provision for students who have mastered skills or subject matter of the various parts, a sequence which avoids pointless overlapping—and still keeps teaching costs down. I believe it is possible to use graduate students for certain parts of the work and still provide a high standard of instruction.

It seems to me, however, that if you expect permanently to strengthen your fundamentals sequence, then it is desirable that at least one regular member of your staff be made responsible for the organization and administration of the work—*someone who is equally sympathetic to the different aspects of the sequence and is willing to concentrate his major energies on activities connected with the fundamentals phase of the department program*. In return, he should be given assurance of strong executive backing and adequate time allowance for carrying on his work, as well as assurance of as much university recognition for this as if he were expending his energies in connection with some other phase of the department program.

In most instances in-service training will be necessary to develop a staff sympathetic to an integrated series and one that is equally competent to handle the various aspects of the program. Undoubtedly you will encounter many obstacles and will find it necessary to make unexpected adjustments. Nevertheless, by doing what is necessary to increase the efficiency of the fundamentals se-

quence, which is really the cornerstone of a speech department, I am confident that the long-term result will be a general strengthening of your entire speech program, on the graduate as well as on the undergraduate level.

THE PROBLEM OF LISTENING

WESLEY WIKSELL
Stephens College

LISTENING, an important and integral part of our everyday communication, has yet to become the subject of much scholarly scrutiny, although infrequent references to listening have appeared in various publications from time to time. Rankin, through extensive surveys, established the great amount of time we actually devote to listening in our everyday life when he found that 44 per cent of our waking time is given over to listening.[1] Searson, after cataloguing the language skills used most often in daily life, found that 1,037 out of 1,335 college graduates who answered his questionnaire needed to listen to addresses, and that 24 per cent of all of them reported difficulties in this skill.[2] Thirty per cent of 1,335 college graduates, 39 per cent of 703 high school graduates, and 34 per cent of 577 grammar school graduates reported difficulties in listening in interviews or conferences. The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association stated that "modern developments are placing a new emphasis on the ability to listen,"[3] and Johnson concluded that "since the auditory method of acquiring information plays so large a part in the learning situation in life, both in school and out, it seems to have a legitimate place as a basic ability in effective communication."[4] Adams believes that "listening is one of the four major aspects of the teaching of English, perhaps the most neglected, and the listener may well be the focal point of emphasis in the so-called speech class."[5] However, he subordinates listening to speaking so that the emphasis on listening becomes a means towards a better ability to speak.

But very little recorded effort has been found which attempts to define listening *per se* except that there is an agreement as to its importance, a need for an adequate ability in this skill, and that it should occupy an important place in the educational program.

I

To all appearances the mental process in listening is similar to that of reading. And, since the two processes seem to be identical except that the stimulus is verbal in one and visual in the other, teachers have assumed that instruction in one would automatically

[1] P. T. Rankin, "Listening Ability," *Chicago Schools Journal*, XII (1930), 177-179, 417-420.

[2] J. W. Searson, "Determining a Language Program," *English Journal*, XIII (1924), 99-114.

[3] *The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association, The Development of a Modern English Program, Ninth Yearbook* (Washington, D. C. 1936), p. 25.

[4] R. I. Johnson, "The Maintenance of Basic Skills," *Journal of Higher Education*, VIII (1937), 357-362.

[5] H. M. Adams, "Listening," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXIV (1938), 209-211.

transfer to the other or that the same kind of instruction for one could be used in teaching the other. The act of critical listening, however, is complex and not well understood. True, listening and reading involve about the same mental processes in this respect: that once the stimuli which are peculiar to each have been received they are then translated into images or ideas. After due learning, most readers or hearers are no longer aware of the words or the medium of transmission itself. The thought or the experience transmitted becomes the reality, and the means by which the new learning was acquired becomes relatively unimportant. Yet, there are distinct differences between the two assimilative skills, and these differences demand different methods of teaching and testing.

In reading, it is possible to adapt one's rate to the difficulty or nature of the material. Words, sentences, or paragraphs may be reread several times. Unfamiliar words may be looked up. Furthermore, material can be read in almost any situation or environment the reader chooses. Listening, on the other hand, demands a great deal more from the individual. The listener must follow the speaker no matter what the rate of speaking may be. Once the word is spoken, unless recorded, the listener has had only that one opportunity to hear it. If his mind wanders, he cannot return to the idea except through memory; it is impossible for him to go back and hear the part he missed. Thus, there is very little time for reflection which is so important in reading. Moreover, the style and choice of words of a speaker and his methods of developing ideas are often not as precise and clean cut as those of a writer.

A second difference lies in the fact that listening makes its demand upon the auditory sense, whereas the reader depends upon visual translation. Hence, one may expect to find individuals who differ greatly in their own responses to these media of reception, just as they may differ in their responses to music and painting. An intelligent and well-trained person may listen appreciatively to a symphony, but look at a masterpiece of painting with only vague understanding and no stir of interest or pleasure. While this difference may be explainable, in part, by factors in past experience and training, it suggests also the need for further delving into the psychological processes of eye- and ear-learning.

Finally, effective listening differs from effective reading because of certain factors in speaking which complicate the situation: loaded words, intensity, color, and inflection which influence the listener as well as the effect of group experience. These factors demand keener perception or greater alertness at the moment than in the reading situation. And, while there may be potentially many more possibilities for enjoyment or learning through listening than through reading, yet there are many more possibilities for misunderstanding or misinterpretation, more possibilities of being influenced adversely, and many more possibilities of being misled in listening than in reading.

II

An examination of listening indicates that it is more than the actual process of hearing. First, it involves a proper attitude and mental preparation before the auditory sensations are received, followed by the act of *listening actively* or the proper mental process of comprehension and interpretation at the time of actual hearing, and finally the

satisfactory retention and proper application of the material heard.

When analyzed, effective listening in all of its aspects seems to involve several factors.

First in importance is certainly an adequate hearing acuity.

Second, the listener must have a recognition of the problems and obstacles which must be overcome in order to listen effectively. Such obstacles existing within the listener himself, or in his environment, might be an improper attitude, boredom, egocentricity, narrow-mindedness, impatience, lack of sympathy, strong prejudices, a lack of interest in the speaker, or in what the speaker is saying. Fatigue is another obstacle to active listening because much effort must be expended in order to assimilate effectively, especially when listening is intensive.

The third factor is *the specific kind of listening situation and the listener's adaptation to it.* The types of listening vary. The listener should know that everything is not to be listened to in approximately the same degree but that success in some situations demands careful, thorough listening (with frequent pauses for critical thinking) for clear understanding and successful retention, whereas in situations where his objectives do not demand more than a cursory type of listening without close attention to details, the listener should be able to get the main idea of the material. At other times, his listening should be characterized by relatively little mental activity with his actions unconsciously influenced by the auditory sensations reaching him. These methods of listening might be cataloged or listed as follows:

1. Exploratory listening: an alert, easy type of listening suitable for most situations. The listener is always prepared to listen intently or casually as the situation or purpose demands in order to react critically or to retain efficiently the material which warrants retention. This type of listening probably precedes all other listening.

2. Listening casually, with the listening act secondary in importance; i.e., listening to an orchestra while dancing.

3. Listening casually, yet with evident interest, to a speech for the purpose of entertainment.

4. Listening in a purely aesthetic situation where the type of listening varies from a highly critical one to evident casualness.

5. Listening to obtain an answer to a general question or for an understanding of one or more broad statements.

6. Listening intently for specific, detailed, and exact information, such as is required in a class lecture, so that the listener can take notes if it is desirable and suitable to the particular purpose. Listening to understand detailed instructions presented in assignments or test directions and questions, where every step must be understood and retained, would require a similar type of listening.

Fourth, there is the relationship between listening and vocabulary. Listeners often have extensive visual vocabularies but find themselves unfamiliar with words in auditory situations. The listener with a good vocabulary can recognize the exact meaning the speaker wishes to convey when using a common word which has many meanings. Furthermore, he has an adequate grasp of the connotation of words and phrases. He is quickly aware of the subjective terms and structure of what he listens to; he can see words in their context, or in word groups, and is able to supply meanings for them. He recognizes and understands the use of figures

of speech, the meaning and significance of transitional words and phrases; he recognizes unfamiliar words, or commonplace words in unusual settings, and studies them with alert curiosity; and he recognizes that the meanings of a number of words, as the speaker intends them, are unknown to him. He is able to grasp the principal thought or idea of a speech of some length; he does not unconsciously change the speaker's emphasis, alter his pattern, distort his treatment, or disregard important evidence, thereby changing the meaning or intentions of the speaker. He observes what is important; in comprehending he recognizes the relative importance of triviality of every idea, fact, theory, or emotion, and its relationship to the other ideas he hears. On the other hand, he can visualize and reproduce the speaker's pattern of organization as well as comprehend and reproduce a number of specific details in their original pattern when necessary.

Fifth, there is the factor of judging what is heard. The good listener will be able to determine the worth and soundness of what he hears by considering and speculating intelligently on the speaker's ethical, emotional, and logical objectives. He knows that the speaker's real purpose is sometimes other than his ostensible aim. He recognizes suggestion, the common uses of appeal to basic motives, the use of rhetorical devices in speaking such as loaded words and repetition, as well as other techniques of speaking, such as emphasis, changes in tone, inflection, rate, and intensity.

III

These theoretical factors must stand careful scrutiny before they can be accepted as representing facts. With the proper amount of careful study, volumes could, and should, be written on this subject, as to its importance, its place in the curriculum, what it involves, methods of teaching it, exercises, and additional problems in research. Until then, a field lies practically unexplored, and the school child (from kindergarten to university), as well as persons in almost every phase of life, will be under a severe handicap because he has not been taught these skills of listening.

Until more practical work has been done in this field, the teacher can make some headway toward the objective of better listening by adopting a few simple techniques of practice and emphasis. In speech classes, for instance, broaden the focus of evaluation to include the effect on the audience as well as the skills of the speaker. Judge the effectiveness of listening and understanding as well as the delivery and organization of the speech. Make every class speaking situation a "partnership situation." The speaker may be in the box but the audience must be behind the bat.

Another device is the deliberate use of listening tests. The "open book" reading test is a familiar and common practice in many classrooms, as a method of teaching students certain skills in reading for specific purposes. Why not the "open ear" listening test for the purpose of giving students practice in attentiveness and retentiveness? Such tests frequently uncover basic difficulties in individual cases, vocabulary difficulty, hearing difficulty, or temperamental and emotional factors.

Finally, the poor listeners, as discovered through repeated listening tests, may be segregated for special study and individual analysis. On the basis of isolated difficulties, further remedial practice may be given.

PUBLIC SPEAKING IN THE SEAGRAM PLAN

ARGUS TRESIDDER
Louisville, Kentucky

UNDER the energetic stimulation of Mr. H. Frederick Willkie, Vice-President in charge of production of the Joseph E. Seagram and Sons Distilleries (and younger brother of Wendell Willkie), one of the most far-reaching plans for industrial education in the country is being carried out at various Seagram plants. Mr. Willkie believes that employees should be constantly in a state of *learning*. This basic principle is best illustrated in the unique Seagram scheme of rotation, by which technically trained men and women move from one position to another. "One of the fundamental laws of life is the law of change," says Mr. Willkie, "and only through change can we accomplish improvement."

By rotation through the great distillery, employees, regardless of their college specialties, whether they are chemical engineers or accountants, learn thoroughly the work of all departments. Sometimes it's a bit of a struggle for a bacteriologist to adjust himself to the demands of the bottling room or for the Liberal Arts major in history to master the secrets of fermentation. Yet this system, which may seem inefficient to those who insist on cobblers sticking to their lasts, has a twofold advantage. (1). The employee becomes familiar with all aspects of the work, thereby increasing his ability. This versatility was very important during the wartime manpower shortage. (2). The company profits by having new ideas injected as new minds meet old problems. Moreover, every employee becomes in some measure a teacher. Mr. Willkie has come to recognize the importance of improving the ability of all Seagram personnel to *communicate*.

Not only through regular study of textbooks bearing directly on the frequently changed jobs can the habit of learning be kept alive, the company's educational director believes, but also by any study under qualified instruction. Classes are arranged in each of the plants, fully accredited by nearby colleges, and employees are encouraged to enroll. These courses are usually taught by regular college professors as part of an extension or adult education program. The only condition is that they be taught at the plants. Students pay a portion of the fees, which are refunded by the company on a sliding scale, determined by the grades. A student who makes an A, for example, gets back all his deposit, a B, 75%, and so on. Courses are offered in a wide variety of subjects, from Spanish to Interior Decoration. One man got his refund for successfully completing a course in flying.

For those who want a general industrial education, however, certain courses are prescribed, leading to a certificate which will have some significance in advancement. These courses, all accredited by the University of Louisville for the Louisville plant, Purdue University for the Lawrenceburg, Indiana, Plant, and the University of Maryland for the Baltimore Plant, are in Accounting, Bacteriology, Public Speaking, Industrial Management, Business Law, Plant operations, and English.

The Public Speaking Course was set up by Professor Alan Monroe, of Purdue University. It is planned for a six-

teen-week period, with one 2-hour period a week, giving two college credits. It is primarily for college graduates, but high school graduates recommended by the educational manager of the plants may be approved for admission. The training, according to the outline prepared by Professor Monroe, "is designed to develop the speaking ability of the individual student by providing instruction in the selection and organization of subject matter and skill in its presentation. The emphasis is on informal speaking on practical subjects." Short speeches are given by each student, one at each meeting, after study of the fundamental principles of speech through textbook assignments and class discussion. In short, a standard extension course has been somewhat streamlined to fit the needs of a particular group.

The first Public Speaking course at the Louisville Plant has just been completed. All the students were college graduates, several with previous credit in Public Speaking, except one, a mechanic, an eager union man who wanted to gain confidence and fluency for his union activities. At first the speaking was much too technical, as engineers yielded to their tendency to talk unrelieved shop. Gradually, however, and almost reluctantly, the speakers began to consider qualities of interest and organization.

At the Louisville plant another unique group is receiving training. They are all Negroes, graduates of various Negro colleges, who have never before been able to take advantage of their backgrounds. They are getting special instruction in sanitation on overtime pay. When they finish, they will be qualified to head sanitary departments of large plants. Among the courses required of these men are English and Public Speaking. Some of these men have been part-time preachers and have the eloquence for which they are famed. All of them respond to the practice in speaking with intense awareness that within a very short time they will have to put the principles to practical use.

As part of the Seagram public relations program, a one-day seminar in public speaking was recently conducted for the Louisville Women's Action Committee for a just and lasting peace. Representatives of all women's clubs who were interested in speaking before their groups about the purposes and plans of the Women's Action Committee were given brief instruction and coached in classes by an experienced speech teacher.

The Seagram Quality Laboratory, in which all kinds of products from plants all over the country are pre-tested to determine consumer preference, has been asked by the president of a famous theological seminary to find out why people do or do not go to church. Since most of the answers centered in the subject matter and delivery of the sermon, the Laboratory has begun an intensive study of audience response to various kinds of sermons. Transcriptions have been made of dull and lively sermons, and "consumer" reactions to them are scientifically measured in terms of physical restlessness, eye-directness, attention, etc. Later, delivery of the sermons will be similarly explored. In addition to tests by instruments, questionnaires are carefully prepared and studied.

The most significant development in speech at Seagram's is an administrative ruling that all talks to be made by representatives of the company must be rehearsed before a trial audience under the critical direction of a qualified teacher of speech, who is called "Con-

sultant in Communication." For example, the heads of all production departments have been charged with the preparation of the best possible program for a four-day meeting in February with the owners of the company and their staff. Every speaker understands that his performance at that time will be an index of his ability as an executive. Frequent rehearsals of departmental groups are held and all speakers are coached in organization of material, qualities of interest, effectiveness of presentation, satisfactory use of voice, etc. No college class has ever had so much incentive to acquire fluency, ease, and forcefulness. For the instructor the situation is utopian: his students have subjects in which they are interested and about which they know a great deal; the occasion for speaking is a very real one; every speaker clamors for suggestions, criticism, opportunity for personal drill; no extracurricular activities or other studies can possibly interfere with the emphasis on making talks as good as practice can make them.

Employees are encouraged to give talks. Many of the special courses being offered require that students make oral reports. Under Mr. Willkie's direction the Seagram Services Department takes active part in the Governor's Postwar Advisory Planning Commission of Kentucky, the Indiana Farm Bureau, the Save the Children Federation, the Louisville Area Development Association, and many other public-spirited enterprises. Speakers from the company have toured the state urging the people to do something about the rehabilitation of Kentucky, whose economic and social deficiencies have been pointed out by the Governor's Postwar Commission and the citizen-sponsored Committee for Kentucky. A Seagram speaker recently discussed a Power Alcohol Program in five Indiana cities under the auspices of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. An average of a speech a week is made before groups outside the plant by company speakers. These speakers all have available a critic who checks their manuscripts and coaches them in delivery.

It is to be hoped that other firms will follow Seagram's lead in recognizing the value of speech to its employees. Someday, perhaps, every public relations department will have its "Consultant in Communication."

PUBLIC SPEAKING AS A JOURNALISM COURSE

REESE D. JAMES
University of Pennsylvania

SUPPOSE you were an important public official or a prominent manufacturer, perhaps a self-made man a little critical of higher education. Suppose a young college graduate of a school of journalism should "ast" you for an "innerview"? Suppose he should say that he had spoken to your "secetary" about being "innerduced" by a member of the House of "Repersennatives"? Suppose he should add that he wanted you to tell him about your "sussess" in life, and that he "unnerstood" that you were "athaletic" in your youth and that he imagined you needed all your physical "strenth" to overcome the handicaps of that period?

Suppose you recognized that the young man was neat, personable, and courteous; but suppose he continued to

offend your ears by asking to "coat" you word for word, as "hunnerts" of people would be interested in what you had to say and his speech bristled with such mispronunciations as "libary," "Febuary," "assessories," "headcorters," "guvment," and "exackly?"

Just how seriously would you take him and just how good an interview would you grant him?

A teacher of journalism—particularly if, like me, he is also a teacher of public speaking—often ponders the answer to such a question. A foreign accent in a linguistic melting pot like America, baby-talk such as 'dint" for "didn't" and literate illiteracies such as "eye" pronunciations—"assosiate," for example, for "assoshiate"—are venial as compared with the slovenly diction of many of our college freshmen and sophomores.

Even our upper classmen might be guilty of saying "I was partic'lar about that lill (little) boll (bottle) I took from the mill (middle) of the shelf. Person'ly, I was defin'ly certain which boll I would run acrost." There is a liberal use among them of "brill" for "brittle," "reco'nize" for "recognize," and of the not so heavenly twins 'gonna" and "gotta."

I

Our pioneer tradition may be partially accountable for this lack of refinement. We are still close enough to the primeval forest to worship the utterly masculine. After a single act of *Richard III*, a Boise audience deserts the theatre because "it won't stand for no hero who's a cripple" and a summer school class of only a few years ago was surprised that a visiting professor offering a course in poetry was a two-hundred-pounder with a booming voice and the shoulders of a football player. Sports writers, coaches, and professional athletes, many of them college graduates, seem deliberately to cultivate a so-called "masculine" way of talking.

The American mother is handicapped by the survival of this tradition in any attempt she might make to improve the speech of her children. The tradition is still so potent, in fact, that unless they are looking forward to a stage or radio career, such an attempt is regarded as wasted effort in the average American home. In his significant essay, "Family Modes of Expression," Dr. James H. S. Bossard refers to the mother's as well as the father's indifference to the progress of their children in the mastery of the spoken word.[1] Few American parents are aware of the opportunities afforded by the conversation of the dinner table. Instead of encouraging their children to talk at meals, they often monopolize the conversation. In a mistaken effort to be helpful, they take the words out of their children's mouths, finishing their sentences for them, instead of letting them learn, by trial and error, to develop accuracy and fluency of speech. They even scoff at the efforts of their children to build a vocabulary through experimental use of unusual words and phrases. In extreme cases, they insist that the table is no place at which to talk. In that event, the prognosis for their children, upon being summoned to the not so festive board, is the same as Gusty's, the farmer boy's of the story. "Gusty, Gusty, come on in and eat yourself once, Pop's on the table and Mom's half et already." Whether country-bred or city-bred, children so inhibited learn little at the family meals except how to consume them in the briefest possible time.

Snytax, of course, can better be taught in school or college. However, with the

[1] *American Sociological Review*, X, April, 1925.

decline in the study of Latin and Greek, it has been more difficult to explain why "most unique" is incorrect and what makes a construction "dangle." Apropos of this decline and its effect on American education, Lowell Thomas has written in a letter to an acquaintance:

> If a man is headed for a career as a writer he should have more than a bowing acquaintance with the classics. On the whole it has been my observation that a well educated Englishman (and the same goes for other peoples of the British Isles who use our mother tongue) has an enviable command of the language. And I have the feeling that this is due largely to the long years of study they give to the classics. . . . For many years my work has brought me in contact with journalists, authors, and distinguished men, all over the world. And a well educated graduate of Oxford or Cambridge or Trinity College in Dublin, provided he is fairly well rounded in other ways, stands out like a lighthouse.

Fundamentally, Mr. Thomas may be right; but he is failing to allow for the fact that the English collegian takes public speaking more seriously than does his American counterpart and he comes from a home whose linguistic and cultural background is more likely to be similar to that of his fellows. In America teachers of public speaking are compelled to spend a great deal of time, in the classroom, in correcting sectional or foreign pronunciations. Their task is even more difficult if they have to correct the errors which should have been eliminated at home.

II

Upon arrival at college, provided they have taken no public speaking in their secondary education, they present an almost insoluble problem to the journalism teacher. If, in addition, they have been reared in a home in which temperamental clashes among the children have engendered resentment of any sort of criticism—including criticism of one another's speech—they may have taken to crawling within their shells. They may have come to feel uncomfortable when talking to people; and it is only natural if, in some instances, they actually fear or dislike having to encounter them. They may even have become "introvert" in a tendency to be "indifferent" to what the world is doing or saying.

Paradoxically, however, they happen to have chosen a career in which a large percentage of their work will be interviewing the beings who compose that world. Journalism teachers should recognize in public speaking a means to the end of changing a self-centered, egotistical, over-sheltered type of student into a wideawake youth who, once he has listened to his fellow students as they discuss their problems and objectives, is potentially an interested observer of humanity in general. After opening the eyes of a journalism student to the folly of living too much within himself, public speaking can focus his attention on the importance of a proper "approach" to people and, in achieving that approach, on the difference between beginner's luck, on the one hand, and resourcefulness or artful planning on the other. Public speaking can teach him the difference, for example, between the accomplishment of the old gentleman who, finally induced to swing at a golf ball, made a hole in one and threw down his club with the comment, "See, I told you it was easy!" and the "approach" of a newspaperman ordered to get an interview with the late J. P. Morgan.

As far as the city desk was concerned, the assignment was in the nature of "hazing," like sending an apprentice for a bucket of steam or a left-handed monkey wrench. No reporter had ever been able to get Mr. Morgan to talk. Our reporter managed to worm his way

past the outer defenses; and, finding himself outside the door of a private office, opened it and came suddenly face to face with the beetle-browed financier.

"Who are you?" boomed Morgan.

"I . . . I . . . I," stammered the quick thinking reporter, "I am an el-el-elocutionist."

Morgan dissolved into homeric laughter and granted him the interview.

It may have ben the reporter's mother wit or his background of experience that came to his rescue or it may have been (which is entirely possible) that, in high school or college, he had taken a public speaking course in which he learned the value of "approach" as based on the ability to appraise the "mood" of an audience—particularly an audience of one.

As every public speaking teacher knows, students run the gamut from extreme timidity to offensive truculence, and some of them have been taught the ridiculous technique of putting up a straw man to knock down. By their manner, they create opposition where none has existed before. Youth, however, is self-centered; and the realization that there is a point of view other than his own is often the beginning of maturity for a college student. Without that realization it is axiomatic that he can never become a successful reporter.

A reporter needs a good voice. If his high school course in speech has been under a qualified teacher of the subject, he may have become aware, even before he entered college, of the importance of having a good voice and of knowing how to use it. Although radio has made America "voice-conscious," there still are far too many college students with nasal, "adenoidal," or high, insubstantial voices who must be bluntly informed, in public speaking courses, that probably the only reason any customers will agree to buy stocks and bonds, or insurance, they are planning to sell after graduation will be a desire to escape from the ordeal of having to listen to the unpleasant noises they utter.

In public speaking classes they can be made to realize how unpleasant those noises can be, as produced by their fellow students and, when recorded, as produced by themselves. In the happy position of being able to follow Pope's dictum that "men should be taught as if you taught them not," teachers of public speaking have only to make a few suggestions to students who have heard themselves as others hear them and who, after denying vehemently that the voices they hear could possibly be theirs, go seriously to work to improve their voices and their delivery. Public speaking can then serve the additional purpose of checking such unfortunate habits as mumbling (which conveys an impression of immaturity), of talking too fast, or (which is particularly unfortunate in a reporter) of dropping the voice on the "key" or significant words.

Nothing is more exasperating to a busy man being interviewed than having to strain his ears to catch the full significance of what is being asked, unless it be a failure, on the part of a reporter, to explain the reason for the interview. If the reporter has been lucky enough to have taken a public speaking course in which he has been taught the importance of "motivation" he will find it easier, later on, to capture the attention of an executive whose desk is littered with letters or memos and whose telephone is forever ringing. He may some day find himself "saving" an interview, after one of his fellow reporters has displeased an executive by asking an irrelevant or even a mildly

insolent question. He may use a relevant question (i.e., "motivation") to bring the "group" interview back on the track.

III

There are a number of other reasons why public speaking should be "required" courses in curricula being offered journalism students. One of them, seldom mentioned though of first importance, is that learning to speak efficiently is essential for reporters-to-be, who may discover, though not with the results contributing so tragically to the fate of a recent Presidential candidate, that they are damaging their throats and burning up much-needed vital energy through ignorance of how to relieve the strain on their vocal chords. Youth has energy to burn, but it is imperative that journalism students be taught to conserve their vocal resources, particularly in an era in which the radio telephone, the wire recorder, broadcasting and television are certain to demand of the supposedly qualified reporter, not only a knowledge of how to use his voice, but also a little virtuosity in his delivery.

In public speaking courses, as in no others, he can learn to report for radio (i.e., for the "ear"); and, through the use of pauses, "shading," and a change of tempo, translate into sound the effects achieved by the size of headline, or by an association of ideas or eloquent omissions on the printed page.[2] He can become that invaluable type of foreign correspondent who is able, by subtle inflection, to suggest the story behind a "story" being partially suppressed by a censor. He can become one of our influential radio commentators.

There is a sovereign reason, however, why journalism students should be given public speaking courses. They are going to be asked to write for a general public who rarely read books and to whom the English language is chiefly a means of communication. They should be taught to write in the current idiom. In many of our purely "academic" courses in composition, students are taught to express themselves in a somewhat "literary" style a little repugnant to the average reader. They are frequently made to feel that writing for the "masses" is actually degrading. If they attempt it later on, they frequently have to pass through a period of readjustment during which they are literally making over their style. Having written of the affairs of the workaday world in the language of the day, journalism graduates are better prepared to earn a living by writing for the public; but public speaking can afford them practice in talking of those affairs and can inevitably contribute to their ability to write about them. It is significant that, in the first curriculum of journalism offered in this country, at the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, "conversation"—precurser of public speaking—was included in a course in "newspaper practice." Including "conversation" (public speaking, if you will) in a course in journalism was following a tradition established by Franklin in his "Junto." Franklin, himself a considerable figure in American journalism, evidently believed that the well-rounded writer should be able to express himself orally.

[2] As the gentlemen who write to the press would say, it is "high time" that some of our radio commentators be checked in their tendency to emphasize all items alike and, what is worse, to suggest by tone of voice what they refrain from saying "in so many words." Investigating lawmakers have at times been made to look a little ridiculous when, in scrutinizing a script, they fail to discover what they thought they heard. Every man alive has had the experience of having dealt with the artful liar who protests, "All I said was . . . "

HONOR ROLL OF SERVICE

In compiling this list, the Association has endeavored to include the names of those who served in the armed forces and of those civilians who disrupted their mode of life to participate in the war effort.

Although we have tried to make the list complete, we may have omitted a few names through ignorance or error. Where omissions are noticed, they should be reported to the Office of the Executive Secretary or to the *Journal*. We shall be glad to include all omissions in the April *Journal*.

IN MEMORIAM

BASSETT, WILLIAM MEREDITH. *Yeoman First Class*, USNR. Died in line of duty, Pacific Theatre.

HAHN, EUGENE F. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Died in line of duty.

MADDOX, JAMES S. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Killed in line of duty.

RAY, WILLIAM T. D. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army. Killed in action, European Theatre.

SNOW, CLAUDE SHIPLEY. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army, Special Services. Died in line of duty, European Theatre.

TURNER, ROBERT GRIGGS. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Died in line of duty.

WHITEHAND, ROBERT E. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Killed in action, European Theatre.

ABBEY, THERON CHARLES. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Weather Observer.

ABERNATHY, M. ELTON. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Armed Gunnery Officer, European Theatre.

ADAMS, WILLIAM WALL. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Classification Specialist and Occupational Counselor.

ADKINS, GALE R. *Corporal*, U. S. Army.

ALBERTS, HAROLD. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR.

ALLEN, GENEVA. American Red Cross.

ALLHOUSE, VERA. Army Service Forces, Deshon General Hospital.

AMEND, VICTOR E. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Classification Specialist and Personnel Technician.

ANDERSEN, MARTIN PERRY. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Executive Officer, V-12 Unit; Armed Guard Commander, Asiatic-Pacific Theatre.

ANDERSON, DOROTHY. American Red Cross. General Field Representative.

ANSBERRY, MERLE. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Officer-in-charge, Aural Rehabilitation at U. S. Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.

ARLEENS, MARY. WAC, U. S. Army.

ARMS, GEORGE. *Major*, Armored Force, U. S. Army, European Theatre.

ARNOLD, CARROLL C. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Combat Intelligence, Chief Clerk, Geographic Section, Panama.

AUER, JOHN JEFFERY. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Instructor and general line officer, European and Pacific Theatres.

AUSTEN, ALBERT A. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. European and Pacific Theatres.

AUSTON, JOHN T. Infantry, U. S. Army.

BAISLER, PERRY E. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Air Combat Intelligence, Pacific Theatre.

BAKER, PAUL. *Major*, U. S. Army. Special Services Division. European Theatre.

BEAIRD, T. M. *Lieutenant Colonel*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Training Officer.

BEAN, LILLIAN. American Red Cross.

BEAUCHAMP, GEORGE. U. S. Census Bureau; O.C.D.; O.W.I.

BEDNAR, RUDOLPH S. *Private*, U. S. Army.

BEHL, WILLIAM A. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Instructor and Squadron Commander, Intelligence Officer.

BELFOUR, C. STANTON. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Prospect, Interviewing, and Executive Officer, Naval Officer Procurement.

BELL, MORLIN E. *Lieutenant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Instructor in Recognition.

BENDER, COLEMAN. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Aircraft instrument maintenance, Pacific Theatre.

BENNETT, ADOLPH JEROME. *Lieutenant*, Armored Force, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

BENNETT, WINFIELD DEWITT. *Lieutenant Colonel*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Combat and Staff Intelligence Officer.

BIRD, W. W. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Educational and Administrative Work, European Theatre.

BLACK, JOHN W., Director, Army Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

BLAKE, LESLIE M. *Major*, U. S. Army. Instructor Officers' Training School.

BLOOMER, HENRY HARLAN. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Line Officer; Aviation Psychologist.

BLYTON, GIFFORD. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Instructor in Lookout-Recognition, Pacific Theatre.

BOGEN, PAUL L. *Major*, Armored Division, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

BONNER, JOHN T., JR. *Captain*, Field Artillery, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

BOOMSLITER, PAUL C. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Personnel Administrator; Officer-in-Charge, Corrective Speech Clinic.

BOWLEN, JAMES HERSCHEL. *Lieutenant*, Infantry, U. S. Army, European Theatre.

BOXELL, PAUL. *Lieutenant*, USMCR. Headquarters Public Relations Staff.

BRACKETT, I. P. Army Voice Communication Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

BRADEN, WALDO. *Private*, U. S. Army.

BRADSHAW, JUDSON P. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Captain of LSM.

BRAIN, HAZEL A. American Red Cross. Recreational Director, Pacific Theatre.
BRAMBECK, WINSTON L. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Intelligence, Pacific Theatre.
BRENIMAN, LESTER R. Air Technical Service Command. Civilian Training Administrator.
BRILEY, FRANCIS XAVIER. Special Agent, Counter Intelligence Corps.
BRONSTEIN, ARTHUR J. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Base Classification and Assignment Officer.
BROWN, JOHN L. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Chaplain and Director of Dramatics.
BRUMMER, DELFORD F. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Pacific Theatre.
BURDICK, RICHARD L. Sergeant, U. S. Army. Personnel work.
BUSSE, ALVIN CLAYTON. *Captain*, USMCR. Procurement.
BUTLER, JAMES H. *Private*, U. S. Army.
BYERS, BURTON H. *Private First Class*, U. S. Army.

CAIRNS, PAUL EDWARD. *Technician Fifth Grade*, Medical Corps, U. S. Army. Chaplain's Assistant.
CALLAGHAN, J. CALVIN. U. S. Navy. Underwater Sound Laboratory.
CAPP, GLENN R. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Ground School Instructor; Voice Communications Laboratory.
CAPUDER, ALBERT L. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Aircraft Radio Laboratory.
CARMEN, KENNETH. Supervisor of Instruction, Technical Training School.
CARMICHAEL, H. KENN. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Education Services Section.
CARR, MARIE. U. S. Civil Service Commission.
CARRUTH, HAYDEN K. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR, Naval Aviation Communications.
CARTER, ELTON S. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Radar, European Theatre.
CASH, EDMOND J. A. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Continental Division, ATC.
CHAPIN, LELAND TAYLOR. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Operations and Lecturing, Pacific Theatre.
CISNEY, MICHAEL. *Major*, U. S. Army. Special Service Division. Pacific Theatre.
CLANCY, JAMES H. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army.
CLARK, DON. *Private*, Infantry, U. S. Army.
CONGER, FRED L. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Officer of USS Breese, Pacific Theatre.
CONNOR, WHITFIELD. *Lieutenant*, USCGR. C. O. of LCI (L), Pacific Theatre.
CORDIER, HUBERT VICTOR. *Corporal*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Cryptographer and Radio Operator.
CORNWELL, CLIFTON, JR. *Lieutenant*, MAC, U. S. Army, Headquarters Unit Commander, European Theatre.
COX, STEWART A. *Lieutenant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Special Services Officer.
COY, RUTH LERMAN. *Private First Class*, WAC. Air Operations Specialist.
CRABBE, JOHN. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Routing of ships.
CROMWELL, HARVEY. Air Corps, U. S. Army. Training Command, Instructor.
CUNNINGHAM, ROBERT LAWRENCE. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Educational Services, Pacific Theatre.
CURRY, E. THAYER. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Fighter Director Officer, Aviation Psychologist.

DARLEY, FREDERIC LOUDON. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Personnel Consultant; Classification Officer, Pacific Theatre.
DASHIELL, DOUGLAS. *Major*, Air Corps, U. S. Army.
DAUGHERTY, JOHN M. RFC.
DAVID, HUGO J. Infantry, U. S. Army. Auditor; Historical Research and Writing.
DAVIDSON, FRANK C. *Captain*, U. S. Army.
DAVIS, FRANK B. *Lieutenant*, USCGR. Commanding Officer, Cargo Ship, Pacific Theatre.
DAVIS, H. BARRETT. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Security and Intelligence Division.
DAWES, ROBERT GATES. *Major*, U. S. Army, Information and Education Division.
DIRKS, BARBARA. American Red Cross. Hospital Recreation Worker, Pacific Theatre.
DESJARLAIS, ROBERT W. *Captain*, Field Artillery, U. S. Army. Training Officer, European Theatre.
DONNER, STANLEY T. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. USS Saint Paul.
DORRIS, CHARLES A. *Lieutenant*, Transportation Corps, U. S. Army.
DRAEGERT, GAYLAND. *Ensign*, USNR. Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas. Bureau of Naval Personnel.
DUGAN, PAUL G. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Pacific Theatre.
DYER, ARMEL. *Colonel*, Infantry, U. S. Army. G-3, General Headquarters, Army Forces, Pacific Theatre.

EGBERT, JAMES H. *Staff Sergeant*, DEML, U. S. Army. Chief Clerk.
EHINGER, DOUGLAS W. *Sergeant*, Signal Corps, U. S. Army.
EISENSON, JON. *Major*, USMCR. Director of Language Rehabilitation Clinic.
ELLIOTT, H. STANTON. *Lieutenant Colonel*, Finance Department, U. S. Army.
ENSTROM, RALPH E. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. CBI Theatre.
ERFFT, KENNETH REYNDERS. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Operations and Control Officer, Personnel Separation Center; Procurement Officer.
EUBANK, WAYNE C. *Captain*, Tank Destroyer Forces, European Theatre.

FAIRBANKS, GRANT. *Captain*, MAC, U. S. Army. Chief, Aural Rehabilitation.
FARLEY, PERL HOWARD. *Major*, Air Corps, U. S. Army.
FEIGENBAUM, MORTIMER L. *Sergeant*, Military Police Corps, U. S. Army.
FEST, THORREL B. Technician, Oak Ridge, Tennessee Project.
FISHER, JEROME. *Lieutenant*, AGD, U. S. Army. Clinical Psychologist.
FLETCHER, ORVELL K. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army.

FORBES, ARTHUR WILLARD. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Staff Communications and Flag Lieutenant, European Theatre.

FORD, JOE E. *Sergeant*, Infantry, U. S. Army. Chaplain's Assistant.

FOSTER, EUGENE S. *Corporal*, Infantry, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

FREED, CONRAD W. *Major*, U. S. Army. Third Reenforcement Depot, European Theater.

FREYMAN, LEONARD. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army, Signal Intelligence.

FULLER, MAX EDMOND. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Asst. Prof. of Naval Science.

GARDNER, WOFFORD G. *Technician Fifth Grade*, Signal Corps, U. S. Army. Cryptographer; Personnel Clerk.

GEORGE, RAMON. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Communications Officer, USS Robinson.

GILKENSON, HOWARD. *Corporal*, U. S. Army. Army Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

GILLIS, HUGH W. American Red Cross. Field Director.

GILMAN, WILBUR E. MAC, U. S. Army. Medical Replacement Training Center.

GOATES, WALLACE A. *Lieutenant*, USNR, Bureau Naval Personnel, Training Division.

GOLDMAN, IRVING S. *Technician Fourth Grade*, U. S. Army. Speech Instructor, European Theatre.

GONDIN, WILLIAM R. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Personnel and College Training Program Administration.

GRIFFIN, LEE M. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Communications Officer, Pacific Theatre.

GULLION, EDWARD C., JR. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Line Officer, Pacific Theatre.

GUNDERSON, ROBERT GRAY. *Captain*, Military Intelligence Corps, U. S. Army.

GUTHRIE, WARREN. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR, Air Combat Intelligence.

HABERMAN, FREDERICK WILLIAM. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Welfare and Recreation Officer.

HAGER, CYRIL. Air Force Training Course. Red Cross Field Director Overseas.

HALSTEAD, WILLIAM P. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Instructor, Army Information School.

HAMILTON, WILLIAM W. *T/C*, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

HAMPTON, VOLNEY. U. S. Army. Speech and Drama work, Pacific Theatre.

HANSEN, HOWARD C. Instructor in U. S. Army, Air Corps, Radio Instructor School.

HARDING, HAROLD F. *Colonel*, General Staff Corps, U. S. Army. Chief of Staff, Headquarters, Replacement Training Command, Pacific Theatre.

HAYDEN, SHELDON M. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Gunnery Officer in Armed Guard, Pacific Theatre.

HAYWORTH, DONALD. Speakers Section, OCD, Washington.

HEFFNER, HUBERT CROUSE. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Organized Speech and drama work, European Theatre.

HELD, MACDONALD. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army, Pacific Theatre.

HERB, PAUL NATHANIEL. *Corporal*, U. S. Air Forces Weather Service.

HERBERT, ESTHER L. *Sergeant*, WAC, U. S. Army. Clerk-typist.

HIBBITT, GEORGE WHITING. Office of Scientific Research and Development, National Defense Research Committee.

HILF, FREDERIC W. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army, Chaplain, Pacific Theatre.

HINDS, GEORGE L. *Lieutenant*, Field Artillery, U. S. Army.

HOLMES, DARRELL C. *Lieutenant*, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army. Alaskan and European Theatres.

HORTON, DONALD HORACE. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Electronics Officer, Pacific Theatre.

HOSKINS, CONDE R. *Lieutenant*, Transportation Corps, U. S. Army.

HOWARD, KATHRYN L. USO.

HOWELL, WILLIAM S. Civilian Instructor, AAF TTC.

HOWES, R. F. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR.

IRVIN, CHARLES E. American Red Cross. Regional Supervisor, Mediterranean Theatre.

IRWIN, RAMON L. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Public Relations Officer.

IVES, ALMON BINGHAM. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Intelligence Officer, USS Chenango.

JANSEN, ROBERT WARREN. *Lieutenant*, USMCR. Anti-Aircraft Defense.

JEROME, ELDON K. *Warrant Officer*, U. S. Army. Instructor in Voice Communication.

JOHNSON, CARL C. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR.

JOHNSTON, ROBERT A. *Captain*, Infantry, U. S. Army. Company Commander; Historical Editor.

JONES, CHARLES A. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army, Psychological Testing Section.

JONES, FRANCES E. OWI, San Francisco, Calif.

JOY, ROBERT A. *Major*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Adm. Officer.

JUKES, VINCENT. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR.

KASE, C. ROBERT. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Theatrical Adviser.

KEESEY, RAY. *Lieutenant*, USNR.

KELLY, JAMES C. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Aviation Psychologist.

KNOX, J. DOUGLAS. *Lieutenant Commander*, Office of Public Information.

KOEPP-BAKER, HERBERT. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Speech and Hearing Rehabilitation Unit.

LAWSON, LUCIE I. Mediator, War Labor Board.

LEMBKE, RUSSELL. Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

LEVBARG, JOHN J. *Major*, Medical Corps, U. S. Army.

LILLYWHITE, HEROLD. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Gunnery Officer.

LOEB, HELEN. *Lieutenant*, WAC, U. S. Army. Director, Speech Rehabilitation Clinic.

LOMAS, CHARLES W. Propaganda Analyst with OWI in San Francisco.

LULL, P. E. *Lieutenant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Central School for Flexible Gunnery.

LUMPKIN, J. HOWARD. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Radio Work.

MAAS, ROGER B. Instructor in USAAF Radio Instructor School.

MCCARTY, ELMER L. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Service Force, Pacific Theatre.

MCCOARD, WILLIAM B. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Fighter Director and Speech Intelligibility.

MCDONALD, EUGENE T. Assistant Professor, National Defense Research Committee for the United States Navy.

MCEVOY, J. EDWARD. *Captain*, Infantry, U. S. Army. Information and Education Division.

MAJOR, CHARLES C. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

MALCOLM, MARGARET E. *Lieutenant*, ANC, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

MALLORY, LOUIS ARTHUR. Research projects for U. S. Army, Air Corps.

MANUCIA, CHARLES F. *Sergeant*, Medical Corps, U. S. Army.

MARKS, SAMUEL M. *Captain*, Field Artillery, U. S. Army. Motor Test Officer.

MARSH, HAROLD CHRISTIAN. *Major*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Armament Officer.

MASTERS, ROBERT W. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Armed Guard

MATTHEWS, JACK. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Psychological Research Unit of the Air Command.

MATTIS, NORMAN. American Red Cross.

MEISLER, BEATRICE R. American Red Cross. Director of Recreation, U. S. and European Theatres.

MERRITT, WILDA M. American Red Cross. Assistant Field Director.

MICHAELSON, ELAINE. WAVES, USNR.

MILLER, CLARENCE ADOLPH. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Submarine Service.

MILLER, GEORGE E. *Lieutenant*, MAC, U. S. Army.

MINGRONE, PETER M. Supervisor of Wiring on B-29's.

MOAKE, MRS. RUTH DEMING. *T/4*, U. S. Army. Taught illiterates.

MONROE, ALAN H. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Air Training Inspector.

MONSON, ALLWIN D. *Seaman 1/C*, USNR. Link Trainer Instructor; Personnel Work.

MOODY, RICHARD. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Communications Officer, Pacific Theatre.

MOORE, PAUL. Army Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

MOREHEAD, HUBERT P. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Liaison Officer.

MORRISON, MURRAY DAVID. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Personnel Officer, Communications.

MOSER, HENRY M. Army Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

MOSER, ELBERT R., JR. *Major*, U. S. Army. Education Officer, European Theatre.

MOYER, NORMAN L. *Sergeant*, Medical Corps, U. S. Army.

NEAL, JOE W. *Captain*, Infantry, U. S. Army.

NEWCOMER, LLOYD. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR.

NEWSOM, WILLIAM B. *Lieutenant Commander*, Bomb Group Commander.

NICHOLS, DEAN G. *Lieutenant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Army Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.

NICHOLS, E. R., JR. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Secret Communications.

NORVELLE, LEE. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Liaison Officer between U. S. Navy and College of the Pacific.

OBEE, HAROLD B. *Sergeant*, Armored Forces, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

OHLBAUM, STANLEY N. *Captain*, Coast Artillery Corps. Military Intelligence

OLIVER, ROBERT T. Office of Civilian Defense; Head of Food Conservation Program.

OMAN, WILLIAM MORSE. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Convoy and Routing Officer.

ORR, LYNN E. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Army Airways Communications System.

PAGE, CLAYTON R., JR. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Information and Education.

PARKE, JAMES H. *Major*, U. S. Army. Entertainment in Special Services.

PAULS, MIRIAM D. *Lieutenant (jg)*, Waves, USNR. In charge of Acoustic Training Program for veterans.

PEDREY, CHARLES P. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Speech pathologist, USN Hospital, Philadelphia.

PENCE, ORVILLE L. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Communications Officer, European Theatre.

PENN, JOHN S. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Communications, Pacific Theatre.

PENNINGTON, R. CORBIN. American Red Cross. Field Director.

PERKINS, LINDSEY SAUNDERS. United Service Organizations.

PETTET, EDWIN BURR. *Corporal*, U. S. Army. Security and Intelligence Division.

PETTIT, CALVIN WEIR. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Insurance Officer, Pacific Theatre.

PHILLIPS, GERALD LEROY. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR.

POMERANTZ, ALFRED. *Captain*, U. S. Army, Psychological Services. European Theatre.

POTTER, DAVID. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Communications System. Middle East Theatre.

POWELL, VICTOR M. *Staff Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Clerical duties, Asiatic-Pacific Theatre.

POWERS, DAVID GUY. Research Specialist, National Defense Research Council, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

PRONOVOST, WILBERT. Development Engineer. Research and Development on Radar.

PROSS, EDWARD LAWRENCE. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Educational Services, Pacific Theatre.

RAGSDALE, PAUL. U. S. Navy. Civilian Instructor.

RAINES, LESTER. *Captain*, AGD, U. S. Army. Education Officer.

RAND, JACOB. *Private*, U. S. Army.

RAMUS, WARD. American Red Cross. Assistant Field Director.

RATLIFF, ERNEST C. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Area Special Service, Middle East Theatre.
READ, ALLEN WALKER. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Information and Education Division. Helped compile dictionaries.
REDISCH, HERMAN S. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army.
REED, ERNEST. *Lieutenant Colonel*, U. S. Army, Service of Supply.
REGAN, MARY CLARE. *Sergeant*, WAC. Deshon General Hospital.
RICHARDSON, RALPH. *Technician 2/C*, USNR. Lecturer in Radar and Ultra High Frequency Theory.
RICKARD, PAUL BUNYAN. *Major*, USMCR. State Liaison Officer.
RIGAL, ROBERT. American Red Cross.
ROSS, MARGARET. American Red Cross. Pacific Theatre.
ROBERTS, HENRY G. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR.
ROBIE, FRED SMITH. *Captain*, Field Artillery, U. S. Army. Instructor in Field Artillery subjects.
ROSE, FORREST H. Speakers Section, OCD.
ROSKAM, WILLIAM E., JR. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Communications Officer.
ROSS, DARRELL E. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army.
ROSS, MILTON J. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. Administrative NCO.
ROUSSE, THOMAS A. *Major*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Director, Ground Training Technical Advisory Dept.
RUNKEL, HOWARD. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army. Personnel Work.
RUSSELL, JAMES. *Private*, U. S. Army.

SANDBERG, ROBERT A. American Red Cross. Director of Fund Raising.
SAWYER, THOMAS M. American Field Service. Waco, Texas.
SEABURY, HUGH FRANCIS. *Captain*, Air Corps, U. S Army. Technical Instructor.
SELL, KENNETH E. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Classification and Assignment Officer, ASTP and Overseas Replacement System.
SEWARD, P. REESE. *Lieutenant Colonel*, U. S. Army.
SHAW, STERLING L. *Chief Yeoman*, USNR. Instructor in Service School.
SHEA, WILLIAM L. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Communications Officer.
SHEETS, BOYD. F.B.I.
SHERKOW, VERNON A. *Lieutenant*, Transportation Corps, U. S. Army.
SHILEY, ROBERT A. *Lieutenant*, USNR.
SHOOK, ANDREW W. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army. CBI Theatre.
SIMPSON, BERYL. *Major*, WAC, U. S. Army. CBI Theatre.
SIMPSON, RAY H. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Supervised activities of military psychologists.
SLOAN, MARY JANE. Instructor in lipreading, rehabilitation aid.
SMITH, DONALD K. *Captain*, Infantry, U. S. Army. Company Commander.
SMITH, PAUL W. *Captain*, USMCR. Fighter Director, Amphibious Forces, Pacific Theater.
SMITH, ROSS D. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Communications Officer, Pacific Theatre.
SNIDECOR, JOHN C. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Curriculum Section of the Standards and Curriculum Division.
SNYDER, JOSEPH F. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USN Hospital Corps.
SOKOL, LILLIAN. *Sp. (s) 2/C*, WAVES, USNR. Recreation work.
SONDAY, FRANCIS L. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army. Acoustic Expert, Aural Rehabilitation.
SONKIN, ROBERT. *Sergeant*, U. S. Army.
SOUTH, BETTY M. *Captain*, American Red Cross Clubmobile. European Theatre.
SPANGLER, EUGENE C. *Captain*, Signal Corps, U. S. Army. Signal Officer, India.
SPINK, WILLIAM B. *Chief Specialist*, USCG. Classification and Personnel Placement.
SPONBERG, HAROLD. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Submarine Duty.
STAINTON, WALTER H. *Major*, Chemical Warfare Service. European Theatre.
STALLARD, OWEN M. *Corporal*, Medical Corps, U. S. Army. European Theater.
STARLIN, GLENN. ASA, War Department.
STEER, MAX D. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Head of Speech Intelligibility Laboratory.
STEETLE, RALPH. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Fleet Training Command, Pacific Theatre.
STEVENS, WILMER E. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army. Military Psychologist and Pre-Flight Instructor, Voice Communications Laboratory, Waco, Texas.
STEWART, ROBERT H. *Sergeant*, Engineering Corps, U. S. Army.
STITT, MARGARET. American Red Cross. European Theatre.
STOKES, JOSEPH MORGAN. *Commander*, USNR. Air navigation instructor and editor.
STREETER, DONALD C. *Warrant Officer*, USNR. Recruiter for U. S. Maritime Service.

TALLEY, HORTON C., Air Corps, U. S. Army. Oral Communication.
TARRANT, L. NEWELL. *Lieutenant*, USNR.
TAYLOR, GLENN JAMES. *Sergeant*, Medical Corps, U. S. Army. Aural Rehabilitation Work.
TEMPLE, WILLIAM J. Research projects for U. S. Navy.
TEW, ROY E. *Seaman 1/C*, USNR.
THARP, ROBERT. *Captain*, Field Artillery, U. S. Army.
THOMPSON, FRANCIS J. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army. Intelligence Officer.
TIMMONS, WILLIAM M. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Senior Script Writer, Motion Picture Production Section, Photographic Service.
TOMLINSON, R. C. Director of U.S.O.
TRAVIS, LEE EDWARD. *Lieutenant Colonel*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Public Relations.

UTTERBACK, WILLIAM E. American Red Cross Field Director.

VANCE, CHARLES CATHCART. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Special Services in Pacific Theatre.
VAN DUSEN, CLARENCE RAYMOND. *Captain*, AGD U. S. Army. Personnel Consultant and Personnel Staff Officer.
VOGEL, ROBERT M. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Navigator and Executive Officer of a destroyer.

WALKER, ROBERT. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR.

WASSON, H. WALDO. *Sergeant*, Cavalry, U. S. Army. Code Clerk, European Theatre.

WATSON, JOHN. *Private*, U. S. Army.

WATTERS, DON A. *Lieutenant*, Anti-Aircraft Artillery, U. S. Army.

WEAVER, DENNIS A. American Friends Service. Overseas 2½ years.

WEINTRAUB, STANLEY A. *Captain*, U. S. Army. Communications Staff Officer, CBI Theatre.

WETHERBY, JOSEPH C. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Port Director Duty, Civil Readjustment Officer.

WHITAKER, WILLIAM BISHOP. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Officer Personnel.

WHITE, HOLLIS. *Warrant Officer*, U. S. Army. Supply Officer, European Theatre.

WHITE, MELVIN R. *Chief Yeoman*, USNR.

WHITEHILL, BUELL B., JR. *Lieutenant*, USNR. Medical Historian of Pacific Ocean Area.

WHITING, ELWIN CLARE. *Captain*, USMCR. Artillery and naval gunfire spotter, Pacific Theatre.

WIGHTMAN, LLOYD L. *Captain*, AGD, U. S. Army.

WIKSELL, MILTON J. *Private First Class*, U. S. Army.

WILKE, WALTER H. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR, Medical Department. Psychologist.

WILKINSON, ALFRED O. *Lieutenant*, USNR. In charge of Fleet Gunnery Schools, Pacific Theatre.

WILLIS, EDGAR E. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Pacific Theatre.

WILLSON, SHERMAN A. *Lieutenant Commander*, USNR. Supervision of Navy Training Film Production.

WILSON, DOROTHY. Women's Marine Corps, USMCWR.

WILSON, GARFF B. *Captain*, AGD, U. S. Army. European and Pacific Theatres.

WILSON, HOWARD WOODROW. *Lieutenant (jg)*, USNR. Training Aids Library.

WILSON, KENNETH D. *Sergeant*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Psychological Assistant.

WINGER, CARLYN R. *Private*, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

WINSHIP, FRANK LOREN. *Major*, Air Corps, U. S. Army. Information-Education program.

WOEHL, ARTHUR L. *Lieutenant*, U. S. Army. European Theatre.

WRIGHT, HARRY. *Lieutenant*, USNR.

YOUNG, MARGARET E. *Lieutenant (jg)*, WAVES, USNR. Instructor in Aural Rehabilitation Program at Phildelphia Naval Hospital.

YOUNGERMAN, HENRY. U. S. Army. Alaskan-Canadian highway project.

ZARR, VALOIS ALBERT. Field Artillery, U. S. Army.

ZELKO, HAROLD P. Engineer Corps, U. S. Army. Assistant Professor of Speech Training Division.

NEW BOOKS

HOWARD GILKINSON, *Editor*

Speech Quality and Interpretation. By JANE HERENDEEN. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946; pp. xxiv+382. $2.50.

"The oral reader is a poet who writes his poem vocally." This statement is found in Chapter I, "Speech as an Aspect of Fine Art," may be considered the theme of Miss Herendeen's book. The oral reader of literature must be a creative literary artist in the sense that he participates in his material to the degree that he might well have written what he reads. This concept of oral interpretation was set forth by S. S. Curry in his *Province of Expression* and was popularized in the nineties by such teachers and writers as Hamilton Wright Mabie, Richard G. Moulton, and S. H. Clark. Miss Herendeen, who I understand was a student of Curry's, gives an eloquent and refreshing restatement of Curry's concept of interpretation, and she applies her principles to the finest of classic and contemporary literature. Her book, published at the end of a long and successful career as teacher and reader in the interpretation field is an important book in the bibliography of literary appreciation and interpretation.

The student in the art of literary re-creation is taken through four stages in the process of preparing material for oral presentation, namely, (1) Discovery, (2) Assimilation, (3) Synthesis, and (4) Reconstruction. In the Discovery stage the student endeavors to grasp the basic *content* of the material. In the Assimilation stage (which would seem to be the most important one) he endeavors to revitalize the *style* of the material and in particular to grasp the special significance of words as they are used in the material being read. In the third stage, Synthesis, he endeavors to see his material as an organic whole and especially to get relative values. The final stage, while called "reconstruction" by Miss Herendeen, is essentially concerned with communication of the material to an actual audience. Communication seems to this reviewer to be a better word for describing this stage. It is concerned with matters of speaker-audience relationship, adaptation of mode of delivery to particular audiences, and the planning of programs.

The author carries out with convincing thoroughness the idea that if the material is grasped by the reader—its intellectual, emotional, and literary values—his vocal and bodily expression will be meaningful and effective. The following quotation is one of the many statements made in the book regarding the cause-and-effect relationship between assimilation of material and the vocal expression of it. "Let us consider what has been accomplished for breathing, tone, and oral structure in the practice of assimilating lines. Words are enhanced in value so that they become perfected carriers of impression. Diction is well modeled and free rather than labored or pedantic. The emotion of the text is sensitized, deepened, and controlled so that the tone which expresses it becomes pure, resonant, and colorful. It must be realized, however, that fresh impulses of tone can be counted upon only where there is reanimation of the language as well as the thought."

The fourth stage in the preparation process, designated Reconstruction, would be more helpful if it were put on a more practical basis. It seems to take too much for granted in the teacher's knowledge of interpretation. There are many problems in this communication stage which need explicit treatment if the student is to avoid the pitfalls of elocution. I should like to see such questions as the following answered: When should material be memorized and when should the book be used? What part does the use of the book play in the Interpretative Reading form of delivery? What are the essential differences between Recitation, Impersonation, Interpretative Reading, and Story Telling? How can the reader make sure that he maintains the suggestive level of Interpretative Reading as opposed to the literal level of Recitation and Impersonation? One of the basic weaknesses of Curry's treatment of interpretation was his failure to distinguish between Interpretative Reading and Recitation. Miss

Herendeen's book could have remedied that fault.

It is Miss Herendeen's infectious treatment of fine pieces of literature while explaining the process of preparing material for delivery which is the outstanding value of the book. She has a catholic taste. We quote as one instance of the many fine discussions of different types of literature her comments on the writings of the three great Greek tragedians. "The reader who would communicate life, beauty, and power can ill afford to pass over the three masters of poetry and drama, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; if his two predecessors tower in genius over Euripides, he with his exquisite singing and more modern approach is often most popular: Aeschylus, our first great dramatist, brings fresh and sublime reaches into life with dramatic poetry; and Sophocles, the artist who built *Oedipus the King*, greatest of plays, keeps in balance compact structure, deep human understanding, actor-proof plot, and matchless vocabulary and form."

As a provocative study in literary appreciation and the oral expression of literary values we heartily recommend Miss Herendeen's book to the teachers and students of speech. It is an eloquent statement of the fact that the interpreter is not an elocutionary virtuoso, displaying his techniques, but rather an artist in communication, endeavoring to bring literature to life.

WILLIAM J. FARMA,
New York University

The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. Volume III, The Protectorate, 1653-1655. By WILBUR CORTEZ ABBOTT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945; pp. xvi+978. $5.00

From a large number of primary and secondary sources Professor Abbott has brought together the detailed information about Cromwell's rule as Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland from 1653 to 1655. As a definitive history of the first modern experiment in dictatorship on a large scale this third volume of a series of four is of general interest today; and as a background for Cromwell's four major speeches to Parliament it provides the student of rhetoric with an abundance of material for the study of the speaker, the occasion, and the audience.

Since the texts of the speeches require only fifty pages, most of the book is devoted to letters, proclamations, conferences, instructions, and various private and public papers of the Lord Protector, with the interpretation and commentary by the author necessary for a chronological picture of Cromwell's activities. Where possible summaries are given of speeches whose texts are not available. Latin documents are translated into English. A great deal of material from European archives is presented for the first time.

The preface sets forth as the purpose "to record as fully as may be the facts of his [Cromwell's] life, great and small, to set his words and acts within the framework of his time, to produce what may be called an itinerary or chronology of his path through life." It also suggests the picture of Cromwell brought out in the seventeen chapters of the book: "There emerges from these details and documents not so much the figure of a Happy Warrior as that of a tired man, old almost before his time; in poor health; not seldom in bad temper; fighting whatever he must sometimes have recognized as a losing battle against the spirit of the people he governed; feared, indeed, but certainly not loved or even universally admired; respected but more often hated; a weary Titan struggling toward his goal." Professor Abbott shrewdly observes: "No one can read his many letters, orders, warrants, commissions, declarations and proclamations in these years without perceiving that the peace he then established was the peace of the sword, that it was no love or admiration of the Protector, nor even pride in his accomplishment, but fear of the army and its general which maintained this uneasy quiet."

The absence of an index and chapter outlines, the fine print, and the lack of listing of documents and speeches make the volume difficult to use as a reference work. But it furnishes the material for a better study in the rhetorical criticism of Cromwell's speeches than has heretofore been possible.

WILBUR E. GILMAN,
Queens College

Amateur Theater Handbook. By EUGENE C. DAVIS. New York: Greenberg, 1945; pp. 237.

This book provides an elementary and rather dogmatic plan of practical operational procedures. It is concerned with every phase of dramatic production. Perhaps the most stimulating sections deal with the making of a prompt book, a detailed and thorough description of the construction and use of a unit set, and a chapter on that important and often neglected phase of dramatics, publicity and business manage-

ment. On the other hand, the discussion of play directing is fragmentary; the chapter on make-up is adequate but not very complete; and many of the assertions are to the 'best' method for handling tryouts and casting are open to question.

Mr. Davis, a successful producer of plays at Glenville High School in Cleveland, is able to offer many helpful suggestions to the prospective high-school director. Unfortunately, in the discussion of scenery and lighting, much reference is made to the Glenville scenic equipment which is far more extensive than that available in most schools.

Many may find the style with its frequent use of the first person refreshing; for others this characteristic will prove an irritant which will hamper fair objective analysis of the text.

This book is certainly not the detailed and thorough work the publishers claim, but it is a good elementary handbook for the untrained teacher who is asked to direct the class play.

JOHN ERB DIETRICH,
University of Wisconsin

Reading Difficulties and Personality Organization. By EDITH GANN. New York: King's Crown Press, 1945; pp. 149. $2.00.

This study is primarily a comparison of retarded readers with average and good readers. It is developed from the point of view "that reading difficulties and disabilities are part of a larger organization, 'the total personality,' and should be studied in this relationship—personality is a functioning unit—a totality—patterned on part processes which have relationships one to another, and which influence each other in significant and demonstrable ways." One hundred and two children (Grades 3-6), divided into the Retarded Group (Experimental) and two Control Groups (Average and Superior), were matched on the basis of chronological age, intelligence quotient, mental age, school experience, and sex. The data on each individual in the various groups included: (1) an appraisal of intelligence, (2) an evaluation of reading adequacy, and (3) study of personality processes. The three groups were compared through an appraisal of the differences between mean values of each of the groups for the aspects studied.

The results of this investigation, stated broadly, indicate that retarded readers are less able than successful readers to cope with intellectual and social situations that confront them. More specifically, the retarded reading group, as compared with average and good readers, gives more evidence of being (1) emotionally less well adjusted and less stable; (2) insecure and fearful in relation to emotionally challenging situations; and (3) socially less adaptable in relation to the group. Further, the retarded group is less efficient in the utilization of its potential mental capacities. The retarded group showed less interest in reading than the other groups. The members of the retarded group were inclined to feel that their teachers had less helpful attitudes toward them and their reading problems than they should have. Finally, the retarded group came from homes which might be less likely to stimulate interest in activities that would promote good reading development than the homes of average or superior readers.

This is an interesting and valuable study. Teachers of speech, if I judge trends in our field correctly, will applaud the dynamic emphasis on the whole person presented by Dr. Gann. They will find the first three chapters of her study a significant orientation summary in the problems of reading and reading disability. They will obtain much valuable information from the results obtained through use of the Rorschach Test with children of varied reading ability. They will appreciate that Dr. Gann carefully avoids drawing unwarranted cause-to-effect inferences from her data. In short, they should learn much about reading problems and about some techniques for studying the handicapped.

The author points out that certain measures used in her study—a five-point Personality Rating Scale, the Interest in Reading Inventory, and the Teacher-Pupil Information Blanks—"have not been subjected to methods of establishing their validity and reliability." Thus the reader may be inclined to consider results from using these measures to be somewhat tentative and subject to further investigation.

ERNEST HENRIKSON,
University of Colorado

Mentor Graham, The Man Who Taught Lincoln. By KUNIGUNDE DUNCAN and D. F. NICKOLS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944; pp. xxix+274. $3.75.

We have waited long for this book, not because it is an indispensable addition to Lincolniana, but because it is a thrilling story of frontier education in Kentucky and Illinois.

Students of speech will find, for the first time, an accurate account of the "blab" or oral school. Eggleston's *Hoosier School Master* admittedly is a caricature of the frontier schoolteacher and actually contains no specific information on the teaching in "blab school" days. Kunigunde Duncan and D. F. Nickols have gathered from Graham's grandchildren and pupils a mass of evidence on the "what" and "how" of learning under Graham's persistent tutelage.

Mentor Graham found his field chosen for him by his name. "Recalling his father's tales of his grandfather's college learning, remembering the swinging shelf of books in the cabin which his father had read from kiver to kiver . . . Jeremiah (Mentor's father) 'wanted that his boy should be a teacher.' Mary, who had only heard of such things, agreed that 'Mentor' which Jeremiah said was a fancy name for 'teacher'—sounded like a good name." And so on a late autumn day in 1800 itinerant Preacher Lynn prayed publicly "for the grace of God to fall upon William Mentor Graham, infant son of Jeremiah and Mary Graham."

And a good name it was. Mentor was a "natural" for the profession. When he was ten years old, he became his doctor-uncle's companion, a student in a "horse-back college," avidly acquiring knowledge of literature, religion, medicine, history, English grammar. At twelve years, he was in Brush Creek Academy reading *Plutarch's Lives*, the English poets, Craddock's *Life of Washington*. At thirteen, he was studying Latin and Greek. At seventeen, married and settled in a tulip-poplar cabin, he was teaching the Brush Creek school, studying between terms at Elizabethtown Academy. There were few textbooks; so Mentor taught chiefly by the oral method. "He talked earnestly, quietly to those children, patiently telling them again and again what they fought hard to understand. . . . He never relaxed in any way his demands for exactness . . . especially [in] the way words were said: none of this 'mush-in-the-mouth' talking." "Not a sound was permitted when a learner, having announced his lesson learned, stood before the rest to recite . . . . His purpose was "to teach the child to say what he thought audibly, clearly, and well." All inarticulate youngsters he sent to a stump in the school yard from which they delivered their declamations until they could be understood in the school room. "Farmers stopped in surprise . . . when they heard some youngster declaiming at the top of his voice from the snowy school yard . . . repeating some memorized piece from the reader." "The alert brain, searching for words, the trained tongue, lips, cheeks—through which thought is made apparent—these were the essentials for putting the world ahead. . . . A commonplace 'whang' bespeaks a commonplace thought, or none."

"When the children tired, he stopped lessons to read to them from the English poets until they brightened. . . ." This was a life-long practice—he taught sixty years—for his pupils in New Salem, Hog Corners, Tonica and Chandlerville remember his dramatic declamations, delivered while striding back and forth to give free rein to his gestures and interpretation. He could bring "goose flesh to his youngsters by reading, with awing gestures, 'Horatius at the Bridge.'"

Eighty years later (1941-42) after Duncan and Nichols scoured the state for first hand memories of Graham they report: "If one thing more than another struck us in talking with these one-time pupils of Graham's, it was their precise and thoughtful language, a joy to hear in contrast to the usual speech of the present day." He was a speech teacher in the best sense of the title, a teacher of *ideas* and their effective expression, founder of the New Salem debating society, a perpetual inquirer into the great questions of the day: Abolitionism, Mormonism, Cartwright's theology, temperance, etc., and in the age-long unanswerable questions of man and his purpose.

The young Lincoln (who lived as a boy close by the Graham clan on Brush Creek) found in Graham something more than a teacher. He found a fellow-philosopher, one who not only taught him the rigorous disciplines of grammar, Euclid, and surveying, but who "after books" engaged in "talk, talk, talk" until Sarah Graham, exasperated by the volley of voices, got up and snuffed out their candle. There probably are two reasons why Lincoln scholars did not consider Mentor Graham worthy of more than an occasional paragraph. (1) Although Graham's training was of inestimable value to Lincoln, Lincoln actually lived under the immediate star of Graham of a short period of six months. (2) It was political strategy to accentuate the lack of education and uncouth nature of Lincoln. By his dress as well as his word, Lincoln himself strove to create this impression. Obviously he could not acknowledge his indebtedness to Graham although he had been Lincoln's true mentor.

One regrets such errors in spelling as "Fort Sumpter"; in fact, as "when Lincoln was nominated for vice-president . . . "; and the inadequate index faults which mar somewhat the scholarly form and appearance. But this is a book which scholars of Lincoln, of speech, and of education will want to read and will enjoy reading.

MILDRED FREBURG BERRY,
Rockford College

How to Improve Your Preaching. By BOB JONES, JR. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1945; pp. 126. $1.50.

The importance of good preaching in the life of the Church has increased in recent years for a number of practical reasons. Not the least among these is the fact that most people no longer attend church services habitually, i.e., regardless of what they feel they receive from such attendance. The minister who cannot answer the questions of his congregation and make them feel that some of their spiritual needs are satisfied finds himself preaching to dwindling audiences.

It is encouraging to find that many of the seminaries of both Catholic and Protestant groups are securing the services of people trained in speech to teach homiletics. Usually sermon preparation and delivery have been taught by persons who were in no sense experts in the specialized field of homiletics. It is high time that the methods of presenting religious concepts to laymen be taught by teachers just as expert in their field as are the professors of Biblical studies, theology and ethics.

Another encouraging sign is seen in the increasing number of volumes written on the subject of preaching. The *Yale Lectures on Preaching*, so long a standard source, have been supplemented in recent years by a number of other handbooks. The short book by Jones covers such topics as types of sermons and texts, an analysis of sermon construction, the improvement of literary quality, holding the interests of an audience, psychology of preaching, delivery, voice, conducting formal service, and radio preaching.

Probably there is nothing new in this volume, but the material is particularly clear and concise. For clergy who have occasion to prepare material for presentation on the air, the short discussion of radio preaching may be especially helpful. The subject of studio etiquette, often neglected, receives the attention it deserves.

The author calls attention to the neglect of the subject of delivery typical in homiletic books, and discusses the topic under three headings: emphasis, projection, and gestures. Much could be said about "ministerial melody"—the current melody patterns that detract from otherwise effective preaching.

"The sermon should be addressed to the intelligence level of the average man or woman" is one of the psychological principles set forth, but the brevity of the book makes it impossible to consider many of the problems of analyzing a congregation. Standard material in brief form is presented in the chapters on types of sermons and texts. The chapter on sermon construction, organized around the three parts of a sermon, should be particularly helpful to the beginning student in homiletics. And suggestions for conducting formal services may prove helpful to clergymen in non-liturgical churches who want to find an effective order of service.

A larger number of specific examples and illustrations as well as detailed applications of psychological principles to preaching would make the book more complete, but an extensive bibliography is included which gives the reader many suggestions for supplementary work.

DONALD M. BRIELAND,
Shattuck School

Lip Reading for Adult Beginners. By HARRIET MONTAGUE. Washington, D. C.: The Volta Bureau, 1945; pp. 144.

This book is a series of loose-leaf lessons in lip reading that have been planned and used by the author as drill material for ungraded school groups and adults of varying abilities. It is not intended to replace any existing material and there is no suggestion for a unique departure from much current class procedure. The distinctive feature lies in the presentation of material for outside practice.

A cloth bound volume is designed for the teacher while the student's copy of identical material is on perforated sheets to be assembled as the lessons progress and bound in paper cover. This arrangement allows the teacher to give out the work for additional home practice as students need it without giving them access to material before it is presented in class. In addition to overcoming a natural tendency to jump ahead at the expense of thoroughness this method of presentation probably creates a keener interest in each new lesson. Another value may be in the feeling of concrete ac-

compliment the student gets as his book grows.

The series of lessons developed out of the author's own need for practice material for heterogeneous groups. They are well-planned to accomplish the desired purpose of maintaining interest while keeping the work relatively simple and allowing for an unlimited amount of practice outside the class.

Each lesson is based on a number of positions and movements and in general are arranged from easily observable movements to increasingly difficult ones. The basic positions and movements are dealt with in relatively few lessons so that considerable time can be devoted to more difficult combinations. This makes the material suitable for review with students who have had some work without mastering the skill.

The language used is natural and colloquial. Conversation topics and stories are well chosen to create interest and enthusiasm if properly presented.

In summary, I should guess that teachers of lip reading will welcome this addition to their repertory of material.

LEROY D. HEDGECOCK,
University of Minnesota

Television: The Eyes of Tomorrow. By CAPTAIN WILLIAM C. EDDY. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945; pp. 330. $3.75.

No discussion of educational radio seems to be complete without the inclusion of television at some point. The future of this new medium is still open to much speculation. One only has to study some of the entertainment trade papers to find out that the television industry, what there is of it, is divided into two camps—black and white versus color television. To know something of the present phase will at least keep one appraised of the possibilities of this medium in the future.

For the serious student of television, and for those who wish to have at least a nodding acquaintance with some of the terms, *Television* is an excellent starting point. Mr. Eddy struggles, and succeeds in most instances, to give meaning to some of the complexities of electronics as they apply. Much of the book is easy reading, but certainly no reader will come away with the feeling that television is just around the corner.

On the other hand, the teacher of speech, and particularly of dramatics may gain some inkling of the implications for speech and dramatic training in commercial television. It is hardly idle dreaming to say that training in speech and acting will play an important part for the television performer. With this in mind, it would be well for those who teach speech to evaluate the present curriculum in terms of a commercial and educational medium of communication that will call upon their graduates to be leaders in this field. Students entering classes this year will graduate into a world of of regular commercial telecasting—and # 150 receivers for the home. Television is, in its way, a challenge to the teacher of speech to look to the future.

Television covers the subject well. The reader gets the impression that no facet has been left untouched. The resemblance to a book on stagecraft is singularly striking at times. There is only one variation to contend with—the television camera. Because Mr. Eddy is thorough, these chapters are organized along with such important related aspects as "Television Lighting," "The Actor in Television," "Television in Education," and "The Use of Films in Television."

In the chapter on education, Mr. Eddy draws an analogy between television and visual education. He attempts to make a case for the use of television to broadcast films into the classroom. One of the criticisms which it has been difficult for educational radio to overcome is that the programs are not being broadcast at the proper hour. How then can a film be telecast into the classroom at the precise moment when the class and teacher are prepared for the material? We are now on our way out of the era of showing an educational film to the whole school because the film was in the school. Even television will hardly tempt the teacher back to those days. Mr. Eddy's eagerness to find a place for television in the future (this hardly seems necessary) betrays him when he steps into the field of education.

The place of films in the future of television seems sure. In fact, from reading *Television* one gets the feeling that the use of the feature film on television is very much a factor in the speed of its development. On the other hand, short films, documentary in nature, apparently will be an important source of telecast material while television is developing.

Television is well worth reading for the many challenges it presents as well as its factual material on a means of communication which cannot help but be important to the teachers of speech.

JOHN L. HAMILTON,
British Information Service

"This is Your Announcer—" By HENRY B. LENT. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1945; pp. 199. $2.00.

"This Is Your Announcer" employs a technique that is effective for young students and for the uninitiated in the way of describing the field of radio art and enterprise. Ted Lane breaks into radio in a normal way and progresses from the simplest work in the studio to the most complex by stages which the reader finds easy to follow and understand. His meteoric rise from platter-jockey to head of television production, however, is a Horatio Algers epic. If this book is recommended to public school students as a means of learning easily the different jobs that may be required of a willing worker in radio stations of different size and power, care should be taken to impress upon the reader the fact that Ted Lane is not a typical young man, that his rise in radio is not typical, and that he overcomes all obstacles far more easily than nine-tenths of our fellow men. Otherwise, the narrative may lead to false hopes of speedy and easy promotion in a business which has more room at the bottom than at the top.

The book will be of value only to a person who knows nothing about the operation of a radio studio. The only good point which it contains for those students who think of radio as a possible vocation is that Ted Lane was not only willing to catalogue radio recordings when he first entered the 250 watt station of WXXR but that he recognized the importance of learning all of the lowly jobs in radio. His eagerness to accept a three or four line part in a radio dramatic show was also a good example for beginners. His interest in the engineer, is also exemplary. It is this reviewer's notion that his visit to the transmitter, however, was prompted less by interest than by the desire of the author to introduce the work of the engineers and the set-up of the transmitter to the reader.

Ted Lane's progress from the 250 watt station (in which he had experience running a platter, ad libbing, producing a dramatic show, and going out on a nemo) to a 5,000 wattt station, a 50,000 watt station, and finally a network is too rapid and too easy for "nature's daily food." Ted's talent for scripts, and direct broadcasts are practically overwhelming. The only excuse for such progress is the fact that a *stranger* to radio can follow this simple narrative far more easily than he can read Abbot's *Handbook of Radio Broadcasting*. It is to be hoped that any person genuinely interested in radio who reads this book will follow with more profound studies (such as Abbot's) which go more deeply into the business of broadcasting and teach the reader far more than this book can.

MADELINE S. LONG,
Minneapolis Public Schools

The Psychological Frontiers of Society. By ABRAM KARDINER with the collaboration of RALPH LINTON, CORA DU BOIS, JAMES WEST. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945; pp. 475. $5.00.

This book is unquestionably one of the significant psychological publications of the time. Dr. Kardiner says that the purpose of the book is "to describe a technique for studying the reciprocal relations between culture and personality and to furnish a reliable critique of cultural forms." Three cultures are analyzed, selected because they offered striking contrasts in personality configurations. The inquiry suggests further investigation—only forecast here—which the authors believe may yield a body of evidence which could "furnish the basis for a critique and offer directives which might compete effectively with the cruder methods in use today for dealing with the soical discomforts of our time.

The book is a continuation of the collaboration between Abram Kardiner and Ralph Linton begun in 1937. Dr. Kardiner, a psychiatrist, interprets the data supplied by the anthropologists. Dr. Ralph Linton, eminent anthropologist, in addition to collaborating on all anthropological data, supplies information on the society of the Comanche Indians in the American Southwest. Cora Du Bois gathered data on the culture of the Alorese in the Dutch East Indies, some of which were published in her book, *The People of Alor*. To these two primitive or nonliterate societies is added a third, "Plainville," a midwestern American rural community which is studied by James West.

This book, like its predecessor, *The Individual and His Society*, continues the effort to reduce the study of culture and personality to a method. The concept of "basic personality" is used. It rests on the postulates that an individual's early experiences exert a lasting effect upon his personality, that similar experiences tend to produce similar personality configurations, that the techniques in the care and rearing of

children are culturally patterned and are similar within the society but differ from one society to another. It is this pattern of care and discipline of children which is the primary factor in the basic personality structure.

A distinctive basic personality or psychological profile was found in each society in the series of analyses of cultures made by the authors. The simplest of the cultures studied was the Comanche, among whom good child care exists, and few anxieties. The Comanche personality is strong and self-assured. The Alorese presented the most difficult problem in psychodynamics because Western culture provided no prototypes of the constellations present in Alor. Unlike the Comanche, their child care is very inadequate, their personality weak and distrustful, their projective system concerned with unwilling sacrificial feeding and appeasement of ancestors, which like the parents, are seen as insistent creditors.

Plainville, culturally and geographically "North-South Border," could not be studied in the same way as the Comanche and Alor cultures since it is not independent, but part of a nation, has a specialized function (farming), and has much more complex psychology. Good parental care gives basis for strong incentive for conscience and idea building, curiosity, and self-assertion, but later in childhood many blocked action systems are created. A picture emerges of general inferiority, stinginess, brutal kidding of children, poverty of esthetic interests, malicious gossip, etc.

The actual characteristics found in these cultures yielded no time-perspective; that is, the analysts could not tell in what way the psychological profile was changed when new problems in adaptation were encountered over a long time interval. Therefore, in an admittedly hasty and sketchy manner the last chapter, "Basic Personality and History," presents a study of a culture with a long history, Western man. No culture apart from our own offered this opportunity. For illustrations of social change Kardiner selected certain phases of Hebrew history the rise of Christianity, the Reformation, the rise of the bourgeoisie, and the growth of science. The conclusion is drawn that the basic personality of Western man has not changed much in 3,000 years. Kardiner believes the anxieties of our society can only be removed "by a tedious process of education which has to penetrate many layers of defenses made up of outworn superstitions and of many customs which are unsupported by any rationale."

The reader may be dissatisfied by the apparent ease with which Kardiner moves from Plainville to the personality structure of Western man, and by some "high level" inferences. But such occasional flaws do not minimize the great importance of the inquiry as a whole. Surely no one who is concerned with General Semantics or with any aspect of the psychology of speech can afford to miss this book.

MELBA HURD DUNCAN,
Brooklyn College

Man and His Works. By EDWARD LEE THORNDIKE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943; pp. 212.

Edward Lee Thorndike, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, was William James Lecturer at Harvard University in 1942-1943. *Man and His Works* presents the lectures, we are told in the preface, with almost no changes. The first three chapters concern man's original nature, his capacity for learning, and his relations with other human beings. The other seven chapters are applications of psychology to language, government, and philosophy.

In Chapter IV, "The Psychology of Language," Thorndike states his basic assumptions concerning language. While these assumptions are by no means novel, they may well be quoted here, since they come from one who is perhaps the most productive, as he is certainly the most influential, of modern psychologists:

> Language is man's greatest invention. It is a social tool more important than the community, the state, the law, the church, or the school. It is an intellectual tool as important as observation and experiment, and more important than logic. It is more important than all the physical tools invented in the last two thousand years. These assertions may well seem extravagant, but they can be justified.

The chapter is heavily involved in semantics or semiotics, as distinguished from "general semantics." The author reveals his indebtedness to Ogden and Richards' *The Meaning of Meaning*, which he commends along with Chapter IX of Bloomfield's *Language* and pages 63 to 80 of Eisenson's *Psychology of Speech*. In the main, Thorndike accounts for the phenomenon of meaning by his twin concepts of repetition and reward, already familiar to readers of his three volumes on educational psychology.

In the fifth chapter, which concerns the origin of language, Thorndike adds yet another specu-

lation to the time-honored theories of the experts in linguistics. His speculations, based on his labors in the fields of experiment and statistics, are most ingenious. The "babble-luck" theory, as Thorndike calls it, is based upon the probability that meaningful connections will be formed from more or less meaningless prattle.

The chapters on law, government, punishment, and individual and community welfare all can be read with profit by anyone interested in the sciences of humanity.

BOWER ALY,
University of Hawaii

The Art of Plain Talk. By RUDOLF FLESCH. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945; pp. xiii+210. $2.50.

The purpose of this book is to provide instruction in the art of practical writing. We have scores of such books. You may well question the value of another. But you will agree that there is much writing which is not clear. This problem has troubled Dr. Flesch, just as it has troubled many other people. He set out to discover the principles of plain talk. The central idea of his book is a formula for the development of a readable style. We are cautioned in the preface not to take the formula "too seriously" to expect from it more than a rough guide.

Lyman Bryson's foreword makes the point that the formula is not intended as a basis for literary criticism. Flesch tells us his book began as a graduate student thesis. The thesis was published in the Teachers College Contribution to Education Series about two years ago. That printing was soon exhausted. The present book is a revision of the thesis edition. The first three chapters introduce the problem and suggest the line of development of the writer's thinking. Chapters 4-8 develop and apply the formula. The last 15 chapters are devoted to other determinants of plain talk. An appendix contains detailed data for the use of the formula.

The formula begins with sentences. The shorter the average length of our sentences, the easier they are to read. A scale is provided which indicates that sentences of eight or fewer words are very easy for us to to understand. Sentences of 29 or more words are very difficult. Standard sentence length is 17 words.

We move on to words and count the number of *affixes* per 100-word sample. Flesch holds that word affixes—prefixes, suffixes and other parts which modify root meaning—determine our difficulty in understanding them. Writing which has 22 or fewer affixes per 100 words is easy. If we find 54 or more affixes per 100 words, we may consider the reading very difficult. The standard number is 37 affixes per 100 words.

Finally, we find that plain talk has a high ratio of personal reference words. These words include names, pronouns, and other nouns which refer to people. They add to our interest and lower the strain of attending to the thought. Our style is easy if we use 19 or more such words per hundred. It is difficult if we use fewer than two personal interest words. A standard number is six.

Chapter 7 tells us how these standards may be combined. The formula leads to a single index of the language of plain talk. The reader who is critical of such indexes would like to know more about this formula. What is its reliability. How was its validity determined? Fortunately one can apply the principles of the formula without recourse to its mathematics. If we are interested, we can determine the validity for ourselves.

Dr. Flesch realizes that the formula will not necessarily lead to good writing. It is offered merely as a simplified measuring stick based upon the three most important elements of the activity. Many teachers of writing are skeptical of formulas, and their skepticism is well founded. The writer should not become preoccupied with the formula as he writes. It is chiefly useful as a technique of criticism and revision. The principles involved should be fixed and operate as subconscious habits.

The last chapters tell us how the formula may be supplemented by other principles of plain language. We are advised to use active verbs, words that carry meat rather than filler words, and beware of ornamentation. Punctuation should be used as a substitute for the influence of voice on words. Write for the people who are to read, not for the linguists or grammarians. Avoid technical jargon for plain talk. Our style may be simplified by learning to talk as we do to children, and to foreigners just learning our language.

There are a number of general features of the book which deserve comment. The dynamic changing nature of language is emphasized again and again. Those copybook pedagogues who operate as if there were only one immutable form for language may turn up their noses.

but even this will not make of living language a static thing. We are frequently reminded of the values for the writer contained in the study of language as it is spoken. Moreover, the study of the science of language has as much to contribute to our understanding of its use as have its history and its art. The book was written primarily for the student of writing, but it also has value for the student of speech. The formula, if it is thoroughly verified, may prove a useful research instrument for the study of language. We may quarrel with the author's judgment about some of his illustrations, but on the whole they clarify and support his thesis. The style of the book is boastful in spots. I should hope the writer may be forgiven that indulgence.

I used the Flesch formula to compute the scale value of the style of this review, and found that it rates "fairly easy."

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER,
Michigan State College

• • •

Citizen Toussaint. By RALPH KORNGOLD. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1944; pp. xiv + 358. $3.00.

"Then dipping her pen in the sunlight [History] will write in the clear blue above them all, the name of the soldier, the statesman, the martyr, 'Toussaint L'Ouverture'." [Wendell Phillips, "Toussaint l'Ouverture," *Speeches, Lectures and Letters* (1892).] Wendell Phillips was wrong. The Muse of History has not imprinted Toussaint's name indelibly upon our skies. Until I read Korngold's excellent book I knew little more about the hero of Haiti than this fragment from Phillips' stirring peroration which I declaimed in "Speech 1" some twenty-eight years ago. I have often wondered, however, if Citizen Toussaint, like Phillips, possessed a silver tongue. The answer is found in this book; I commend it for serious and exciting reading.

Evidence of Toussaint's rhetorical skill may be found at every stage of his career, Korngold describes him in an arduous campaign as a young man: "Strict disciplinarian though he was, Toussaint was a leader after their own heart. He would ride up and down the line during the march, encouraging his men, calling them his 'children,' mingling religious exhortations with coarse jokes, raising his voice in song together with the soldiers."

He enjoyed jest and banter and often used them to good purpose. "Once a Negro asked him for an appointment to a judicial post. 'I'll gladly do so,' said Toussaint, 'for of course you know Latin. . . . What! You don't! How the devil do you expect to be a judge without knowing Latin? Vade retro!' "

Toussaint knew how to incite his followers to superhuman achievement. On the eve of the assault against the British he proclaimed to his army: "Do not disappoint me. Prove yourselves men who know how to value liberty and how to defend it. Do not permit the desire for booty to turn you aside from the performance of your duty. . . . We are fighting that liberty—the most precious of all earthly possessions—may not perish. We are fighting to preserve it for ourselves, for our children, for our brothers, for our fellow citizens."

When Brigadier-General John Whyte issued an order, "No quarter for the brigands! Take no prisoners!" Toussaint scorched him with satire: "I am only a black man. I have not had the advantage of the fine education that the officers of His Britannic Majesty are said to receive; but were I to be guilty of so infamous an act, I should feel I had sullied the honor of my country."

The value of dramatic appeal he well understood. When Negroes and mulattoes were rioting at Port-de-Paix he appealed to them by holding up a bottle in which red and white wine had been mixed, and cried: "You should become like this—one substance! Love one another."

On another occasion to make the effect more telling, he ordered the French prisoner, Hédouville, and his Negro confederate, Manigat, brought into the public square at Fort Dauphin. Then Toussaint mounted a cart and accused them publicly: "Just as I had driven the British from the colony, just as I was about to enjoy the fruits of so much struggle and labor, Hédouville found a Manigat. Yes, a Manigat. Are you a Manigat? Well, you're an expert plotter. Hédouville chose a Negro to destroy the brave General Moyse and the fifth regiment, who have contributed so much towards clearing the colony of our enemies. You wanted to kill them. Did you not realize that behind them stood a mass of blacks who would have avenged their death. . . . As head of the army I have, however, not forgotten the words: Forgive us our trespasses and we forgive those who trespass against us. Mindful of this injunction, I forgive you. Remember henceforth that neither a Manigat, nor a Hédouville has a right to suspend a general and that he who draws the sword shall perish by the sword." (pp. 167-168)

Three years later, Toussaint stepped on board the frigate, Heros, which was to carry him to

prison and death in France. He said to General Severin: "In overthrowing me they have only felled the tree of Negro liberty in St. Domingo. It will shoot up again, for it is deeply rooted and its roots are many."

Here is a good and a readable book for all students of the word, spoken and written.

MILDRED F. BERRY,
Rockford College

The Hays Office. By RAYMOND MOLEY. New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1945; pp. 266. $3.75.
Economic Control of the Motion Picture Industry. By MAE D. HUETTIG. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944; pp. 163. $3.00.

Speech teachers, because of their association with dramatics, are frequently questioned on the activities of the motion picture industry. One question often asked is "Why is Hollywood like that?"

Two books of comparative recent release, *Economic Control of the Motion Picture Industry* by Mae D. Heuttig and *The Hays Office* by Raymond Moley, if read in succession with considerable between-the-line interpretation, reveal in no small way why Hollywood is like that. The Huettig volume is a thorough and apparently objective study of the financial involvements of the motion picture industry. The research was made possible by a fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation. One should not be misled by the formidable title, for, although there are tables of statistics, the reading matter and many of the tables reveal some interesting facts about a large industry, the products of which are considered by some to be art and by others as pure entertainment and nothing more.

The first chapter of the *Economic Control of the Motion Picture* is the least interesting, for it tells the story of how the industry came to be in its present position. The subsequent chapters deal with the present financial structure of the industry. Without too much digging, one can learn the status of the industry as compared with others; the relationship between the five major companies; the distribution set-up; and the all important business of exhibition. These factors in turn explain minor items such as why we have B pictures, the value of double features, salaries versus production costs and last but not least, the old challenge of art versus entertainment. This book is well worth reading, for, quite different from most publications about motion pictures, it considerably de-glamorizes the industry.

Raymond Moley's book is considerably longer and actually more tiring than the statistical volume described above. One has the feeling that Mr. Moley went out of his way to see that no reader should have a bad thought about the Hays office. In this he succeeds if one accepts the original premise that films are better because the Hays Office exists. Thoughtful readers may find considerable in this volume to make them wonder. Certainly one can hardly deny that the Hays Office is an outstanding example of an agency aimed at the self-restriction of a whole industry. It is interesting to note the growth of the Hays office. This volume is a defense of an agency in which the industry undoubtedly takes considerable pride. For those who wish that films could be a little more "adult," this book offers an explanation as to why they are not.

JOHN L. HAMILTON,
British Information Services

The First Lincoln Campaign. By REINHART H. LUTHIN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944; pp. viii 328. $3.50.

Pious men have sometimes sensed in Lincoln's nomination at Chicago the interdiction of an all-wise Providence. But not Dr. Luthin. He approaches his problem with cool objectivity. Trained in the exacting methods of historical research, he explores the sources of his problem. His documentation is so meticulous that the average reader may find it forbidding. From the bottom of many a dusty file he brings to light much that is new. The result is that he piles evidence high to show that Lincoln's triumph at Chicago in 1860 came by virtue of "considerations of expediency grouped under the familiar term 'availability'. . . ."

Seward's political liabilities were as the sands of the sea. His feud with Millard Fillmore had set the Know-Nothings in the Republican party against him; and the New York delegation was not solidly behind his candidacy. Thurlow Weed's sponsorship of his campaign in no way enhanced his standing. Nonetheless, Seward's gravest political delinquency was his radical anti-slavery record. This was the essence of his lack of "availability."

The Republican convention of May, 1860, Dr. Luthin points out, was not an Abolition conclave. Far from it. It is true that Abolitionists attended the meeting, there being no better place for them to go, politically; but Repub-

lic[illegible]m and Abolitionism were not synonymous co[illegible]pts. Webster and Clay were dead. The Wh[illegible] party was gone, and the Know-Nothings had served their ephemeral purpose. A new or[illegible]zation was on the march.

The young bloods seeking to cement the pa[illegible]quilt elements at the Wigwam were out chiefly for political power and public office. Painfully they had watched two successive Democratic administrations take charge in Washington and dispense political favors. The Buchanan-Douglas feud that split the Democratic party was in no small measure caused by patronage. Those in Chicago yearned for the privileges and emoluments of patronage; in a word, the "outs" wanted "in."

The same stick that tarred Seward blackened Salmon P. Chase. In truth, the latter was farther left of center on slavery than Seward. This eliminated him as the second choice of those who supported Seward. But the Ohioan's lack of "availability" went far beyond his anti-slavery position. Chase was distrusted in the East by virtue of his low tariff views. This turned Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and southern Ohio against him; to these areas, a protective tariff, not anti-slavery, was the primary concern. Chase had also antagonized the Know-Nothings in course of making a play for the German-American votes in his Ohio campaigns. Old-line Whigs had never forgiven him for his "shady" deal in 1849 which resulted in his election to the federal Senate over an orthodox Whig. Aloof and cold, personally, Chase lacked the glamor essential to inspirational leadership in a national election. He further lacked a loyal and shrewd supporting organization. Add to all this the fact that Ohio also presented Wade and McLean to the convention as candidates for the presidency. Clearly, Chase was unavailable.

Edward Bates, of Missouri, fell meekly by the wayside in the early hours of the convention. He was the candidate of the Blair family, and he drew his main support from those who veered right of the middle of the road on all issues. An unreconstructed Whig, he was tainted with nativism, for he had supported Fillmore in 1856. Like the Know-Nothings, he chose to ignore the anti-slavery issue. Yet, he scorned the state's rights doctrines of Calhoun no less vigorously than he disdained the "Higher Law" doctrine of the Abolitionists. The eager young men organizing the vagrant elements in the Wigwam saw only negation and defeat in the aged and respected personality of Bates. It was sound politics to shun him in 1860.

Simon Cameron, Pennsylvania, was essentially local in his appeal, for he was strong only in his own state and in New Jersey, where his protective tariff views were well received. He had some support in southern Ohio for the same reason. Like Chase, he lacked inspirational backers; and he had a reputation for sharp practices. He also lacked the solid backing of his own delegation, by reason of a quarrel with Andrew C. Curtin and Alexander K. McClure. At the end of the second day of the convention, Cameron realized the helplessness of his cause and withdrew from the contest.

Among the lesser contenders, Banks was too much like Bates. McLean was too old. Collamer and Dayton and Fessenden were from small states. Wade was too much like Chase.

There remained Abraham Lincoln. He had the solid and stubborn support of his own state. He had procured pledges of second choice votes for himself from other delegations. His slavery record was good. He opposed the extension of slavery into federal territories. But he was more conservative on the issue than Seward or Chase, and more liberal than Bates or Cameron.

He had few enemies, for he was too unknown to have much opposition against him. A former Henry Clay Whig, his views on the tariff appealed to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and southern Ohio. He had shunned the pitfalls of nativism, and instead had cultivated the good will of the German-Americans. He came from one of the four pivotal states that had to be carried to assure Republican success in 1860. Against Douglas in 1858, and at Cooper Union in 1860, he had made brilliant showings as a debater, and ably had his backers availed themselves of the publicity material of these occasions. He had adroit and masterful management in Chicago. Luthin remarked, "Lincoln's nomination was procured through the familiar channel—of applied politics." "Availability" and "applied politics" thus become one and the same thing.

This book has high merit. But will the general public read it? There is reason to fear that the dour austerity of the style in which the facts are written will repel the general reader. If this happens, the superstition will continue to prevail that Lincoln was mystically chosen at Chicago to lead the Republicans out of the wilderness.

EARL W. WILEY,
Ohio State University

Freudianism and the Literary Mind. By FREDERICK J. HOFFMAN. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1945; pp. 346. $4.00.

The selection of a title for this book seems to this reviewer to be the first of several fundamental mistakes made by the author. Should Freud's theories be classified as an "ism"? And what is "the literary mind"?

Mr. Hoffman says he has attempted "to survey the contributions of Freudianism to the aesthetic of our century." Beyond the preface he seems to break down "the aesthetic" to mean the aesthetic imagination at work in twentieth-century creative writing. Actually he presents an analysis of only six novelists, with brief discussion of four more "literary minds," with two of whom few readers will be acquainted.

The first chapter proceeds in orderly academic pattern to summarize briefly the main aspects of Freudian theory. Three stages in development are noted: the clinical, the metapsychological, and the practical. Dr. Hoffman believes the real importance of Freud for the literature of his own period came from the popularity of his earlier works, especially *The Interpretation Of Dreams* (published in 1901, translated by A. A. Brill in 1913).

The reader's age will probably determine in part his reaction to the second and third chapters: "Spread of Freud's Theories" and "Freudianism—American and English." They trace the first recognition of Freud, the battles over him, the popular misrepresentations. By 1915 "psychoanalysis was fairly well launched in the magazines from which the intellectual of the day drew his information." For one who, like this reviewer, met Freud's theories in college after much of the first furor had subsided, and had no religious barriers to their consideration, the assimilation of them was achieved matter-of-factly. Direct experience with the excited reaction to a new sensation in psychology was therefore largely absent. The reader with such acquaintance with Freud may scarcely have realized that the Greenwich Village "intellectuals" were the first to wrangle over psychoanalysis. To anyone acquainted through her books with Mable Dodge Luhan's wide circle (she was then Mable Dodge Sterne), it is not surprising to read that Walter Lippman invited Brill to speak at one of her "evenings" in the Village, where the probing of the Unconscious was being pursued with avidity.

These two chapters are of considerable historical interest, but they would have been improved if Dr. Hoffman had given less elaborate documentation. Although the footnotes might be acceptable in a Ph. D. thesis, they are unconventional in the type of historical survey he is presenting and sometimes place undesirable weight of emphasis on observations of doubtful significance.

In Chapter IV the author attempts to show the problem of evaluating influence. He summarizes four reasons for difficulty in disentangling genuine influences of Freud from false ones and gives five "levels of comprehension" on which a writer might have encountered some part of Freudian theory. (A Mabel Dodge Sterne "evening" is classed as the level of fragmentary presentation). This would be very interesting if it led to the question of changes in literature brought about by the tremendous impact of Freud's theories. But it is here that a fundamental error in emphasis begins to be apparent.

The suspicion that Dr. Hoffman has directed his efforts to mistaken end is strengthened in the next six chapters. Five of them are devoted to analyses of six novelists: James Joyce, D. H. Lawrence, Sherwood Anderson, Waldo Frank, Franz Kafka, and Thomas Mann. It is not clear why these authors have been chosen to represent "the literary mind." The sixth chapter, "Further Interpretations," presents briefer discussions of Conrad Aiken, Ludwig Lewisohn, Dylan Thomas (a young Welsh poet), and Henry Miller. Dr. Hoffman says he has selected these four "because of their essential aesthetic integrity —the clarity and continuity of their creative lives." One is glad to see Conrad Aiken here, since unmistakably he is a creative artist who has taken a serious interest in Freud. But why include Henry Miller, literary expatriate, contributor to arty magazines, who has reached no public beyond a little cult of readers, who certainly represents no more than a small dark corner of "the literary mind"! (Read his "The Air Conditioned Nightmare," *New Directions*, 1945).

For the six novelists discussed at length, scrupulous care has been taken in documentation on the time of each man's introduction to the works of Freud, and how each changed Freud's theories to fit his own beliefs, but we are told little of how Freud's theories affected the characteristics of twentieth century literature.

The author implies that even without Freud three of his six novelists—Joyce, Lawrence, and Anderson—would each have reached his individual interpretation of the role of the

irrational in behavior. In the instance of Kafka, Dr. Hoffman presents a Freudian interpretation of what makes the novelist tick as he did, instead of an analysis of the influence of Freud on the author's writing.

In spite of what this reviewer feels is a shortcoming in method, Dr. Hoffman's painstaking studies will add to any reader's background on the novelists considered, particularly on Lawrence and Mann.

A chapter entitled "Precursors of Freud" presents "some of the other influences upon twentieth century attitudes which make up the complex picture of our cultural heritage": Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Dostoevsky. Perhaps a clue to what seems to this reviewer to be a third weakness in the book may be found in a reference in the conclusion to the philosophy of Kierkegaard (Danish philosopher who wrote 100 years ago, and whose major works have been translated only since 1935): . . . "there is no doubt that the recent translations into English of the philosophic works of Soren Kierkegaard will give the dialectic and irony of the Danish thinker exceptional prominence among intellectuals of another postwar period." Who are "the intellectuals"? Kafka's resignation and Kierkegaard's ironic position on one hand and Thomas Mann's confidence in the practice of reason on the other, Dr. Hoffman believes to be the likely alternatives for the postwar period.

Not only does the author sometimes force criticism (and Freud) into a philosophical mold, but there are suggestions throughout that his method develops through the approach of philosophy where the methods of psychological analysis and of literary criticism would be more appropriate and sounder for the purpose. There is evidence in the interpretation of events and in terminology of a tendency to fall into verbal traps, and some dubiously metaphysical discussions add little to the stated thesis.

As a series of essays on authors the book would have been interesting, and often enlightening, and the reader would not have expected too much. It was a mistake to put the material together under a pretentious title and to employ a limited method which did not include a broad critical overview. The dynamic influence of Freud's theories on literature is somehow lost.

MELBA HURD DUNCAN,
Brooklyn College

Ideas in America. By HOWARD MUMFORD JONES. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1944; pp. xi+304. $3.00.

Ideas in America is not so much a book as a collection of books. It is made up of thirteen rather disparate essays and addresses, grouped under the following heads: The Need for Literary History; Studies in the History of Ideas in America; The Responsibilities of Contemporary American Literature.

The first group is a series of three persuasive addresses delivered before (1) the English Section of the Modern Language Association of America (1935); (2) the Colonial Society of Massachusetts (1936); and (3) the Program in American Culture and Institutions of the University of Michigan (1940). The proposition urged in these addresses is that "American literature should have a central place in the thinking of American scholars."

The second group is a series of five scholarly papers, of which three are presented independently. The others have heretofore appeared as (1) an address before the American Philosophical Society (1942); and (2) a contribution to the symposium on Classicism and Romanticism at the Harvard Tercentenary Conference of Arts and Sciences (1936).

The third group consists of an independent essay, "The New England Dilemma," and four addresses of diverse background: (1) the Phi Beta Kappa Address at Dartmouth College (1937); (2) the Founder's Day Address at Wheaton College (1938); (3) an address delivered at Southern Methodist University (1941); and (4) the Phi Beta Kappa Address at Wellesley College (1942).

The central doctrine of the book is "that a mature interpretation of our own intellectual and cultural history ought to be one of the important concerns . . . of American scholarship." To the advocacy of his central doctrine, the author brings a penetrating mind informed by wide reading of Americana.

He has had the advantage of residence in all parts of the United States and of academic connections with leading universities—North, South, East, and West. Fully appreciating the power of American regionalism, he is, nevertheless, too broad in his interests to be a regionalist. He advocates the study of American literature and American history; yet he is too wise to neglect British and other European sources or correlatives of American culture.

Dean Jones is at his best when he argues the case for American studies. His proposition is

well stated, his argument is well organized, his evidence is convincing, and his language is compelling and clear. The essays on the history of ideas in America suffer by comparison. Much of the quantity of matter quoted in them could have been paraphrased, in the opinion of this reviewer, without detriment to the thought expressed and with considerable assistance to the reader's understanding and the writer's style.

Taken separately, every essay is provocative; every one raises questions and yields conclusions. The essay most immediately useful to the study of rhetoric and public address is perhaps that entitled "American Prose Style: 1700-1770." The style considered is chiefly that of homiletics, notably of the New England sermon. One theory of prose developed in eighteenth-century America is set forth clearly and summarized in the following statement: ". . . enough has been shown to illustrate how deep-rooted in our national history is the avoidance of fustian prose, how old is the emphasis upon plainness, how ancient is our distrust of ink-horn terms, a distrust expressing the average man's lack of ease in the presence of the scholar. Notable, too, is the drive against contentiousness, itself an aspect of a deep-seated belief in fair play. And if none of these elements in the stylistic controversy I have studied is peculiar to America, they indicate in their totality that we must push back the supposed origin of some of our inellectual and moral traits, we must see that the colonial periods originate much that we have unthinkingly referred to the so-called "national" period. Prose style has its modest part to play in the history of ideas in America."

The final sentence above is surely an understatement. In this connection, it is noteworthy that, although the author draws on speeches and addresses as well as upon essays and histories he does not anywhere make a distinction between rhetoric and literature, or between oral and written style. Perhaps the distinction is not relevant to his major concern, which is with idea rather than with form. Yet he specifically declines (p. 29) to define the term "literature." Not even a definition is forthcoming for "rhetoric"; and the use to which the term is put must lead the reader to question whether it is not employed in a somewhat invidious sense. As the essays stand, one is left to wonder whether their author has well considered the problems of rhetorical as distinguished from literary criticism. Can it be that, like Moses Coit Tyler, Barrett Wendell, and other distinguished critics before him, the author is essentially a literar man attempting the task of the rhetorician?

Since he has (in his own phrase) "sunk to b an administrator of sorts" as Dean of the Har vard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, w may never know. Hence we have one more rea son for regretting the American practice of con suming the energy of scholars in administration The present moment may be better served by Howard Mumford Jones as Dean; but the future is being deprived of the comprehensive history of American literature foreshadowed in the essays here reviewed.

BOWER ALY,
University of Missouri

"Hiawatha" with Its Original Indian Legends. By CHASE S. OSBORN and STELLANOVA OSBORN. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Jacques Cattell Press, 1944; pp. 255. $2.50.

The main purpose of this book is to make known the sources of Longfellow's materials for "Hiawatha." These sources were the writings of Henry Rowe Schoolcraft. Following three introductory essays, the main body of the work consists of twenty-three sections, each section an excerpt from the writings of Schoolcraft and its parallel passage from the poem.

The first essay is devoted to the Hiawatha country, the region of Lake Superior, "the shores of Gitche Gumee, the shining Big-Sea Water." High praise of this region is clothed with authority by a statement of fact: "At one time one of the authors of this book went around this inland ocean on foot. At another time he paddled and sailed a canoe completely around its shores." No one with a grain of zest for exploration, particularly if he has fallen under the spell of the Lake Superior country, can read this essay without wishing he were foot-loose and free to follow. The second essay gives us, with some admixture of Indian legend, an account of the origin, wars, and migrations of Hiawatha's people, the Chippewas, who at the time of the action of the poem are assumed to have occupied a territory extending for a thousand miles from Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, to western Minnesota. The third essay, entitled "The Genealogy of Hiawatha," characterizes Hiawatha as "one of Michigan's honored citizens . . . the best known personality that the state has yet produced; for in many languages, the story of the Indian leader is familiar around the world." He was "born" of an association of Indians and white people, brought about through the marriage of John Johnston and Ozhaw-guscoday-

wayeus, daughter of Waub-Ojeeg, famous Chippewa chief, whose daughter in turn became the wife of Henry Rowe Schoolcraft. It was in the log house Schoolcraft built on the St. Mary's in which he heard and recorded in his "Algic Researches," the Indian tales and legends told by Ozhaw-guscoday-wayquay and her daughter, Jane Johnston Schoolcraft.

Other sources on which Longfellow drew were Schoolcraft's "Oneóta," and *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Conditions, and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States*. The latter, a monumental work in six tomes, was published in 1851. Longfellow pored over these writings for three years. Their effect on him is suggested by an entry in his diary in 1854: "I could not help this evening making a beginning of Mánabozho, or whatever the poem is to be called." As the authors say, without the writings of Schoolcraft "Hiawatha" would never have come into existence.

In their book, Mr. Osborn and his daughter have very properly followed the lead of Longfellow by including only those passages from Schoolcraft which are parallel with the corresponding parts of the poem; but a cursory reading of the writings of Schoolcraft reveals the fact that Longfellow selected and rejected from Schoolcraft the materials for his poem with sole reference to his purpose of making a "pleasing" and unified work of art. Although Hiawatha was the Iroquois name of the legendary Indian hero, and the Iroquois and Chippewas were bitter enemies for a hundred years, he finally chose "Hiawatha" as the name of the Chippewa hero. Whether his purpose was to suggest what appears to have been the essential unity of Indian culture or to give his poem a title more euphonious than "Mana-bozho" remains an open question. His selectivity is further shown by his making Hiawatha a beneficent being. Of his actual character in Indian legend, Schoolcraft says: "He was everywhere present where danger presented itself, power was required, or mischief was going forward. Nothing was too low or trivial for him to engage in, nothing too high or difficult for him to attempt. He affected to be influenced by the spirit of a god, and was really actuated by the malignity of a devil." (*Myth of Hiawatha*, p. 50). This is one of many similar passages in Schoolcraft which point to the barbaric primitiveness of early Indian culture and, by contrast with Longfellow's hero, show the poet's adaptation of his source material to his purpose.

The authors of this book have performed a valuable service for various classes of readers. No long poem, with the possible exception of "Evangeline," has been read by so many young people as has "Hiawatha." For many such readers this edition of the poem will be of mature interest.

FRANK M. RARIG,
University of Minnesota

The New Prometheus. By LYMAN BRYSON. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944; pp. 107. $1.25.

Those persons who assume that speech education should have at its base a generalized scientific method will find support in this thirteenth volume in the Kappa Delta Pi series, written by the director of education for the Columbia Broadcasting System and professor of adult education at Columbia University. In this volume Professor Bryson emphasizes the pressing and illusive problem of teaching mass-man to think and think straight.

"In our day the most valuable possession we have which is not wide-spread among the people is the scientific attitude of mind. . . . It is time to stop using intelligence only for tricks of practice and apply it to the largest aspects of human affairs. . . . Resistance to the furtherance of scientific thought exists today in centers of great learning and among very learned men. . . . These are the authoritarians also, those who have misread and misruled the findings of science to discredit thought about human affairs. . . . If men can learn to think dispassionately, they will have more control over their material environment and even over their own selves. . . . Knowledge is essential but it is not enough; the method is more important. . . . A man cannot think, however, unless he can also learn. Knowledge and thought cannot be made two separate functions of the mind, as if one part were a basket and the other a blade. . . . A student who learns to think straight is soon going to find that his straight thinking gets him knowledge he could not otherwise have. A leader of the people who, instead of egging us on to employ our talent for confusion, began to ask us to use our minds as rigorously as possible on public affairs would soon find it difficult to do anything else because we would know too much. . . . The fight for knowledge and the fight for democracy are the same battle. . . . But scientific or objective thinking is what we need most. The making it a more general habit among men is not impossible."

It would have been interesting if Professor

Bryson had reviewed and analyzed some of the past failures to teach better mass-thinking. He suggests no particular methodology for thinking nor a methodology for teaching it. We assume that he is aware that probably only the *attitude* of the physical scientist with a very few of his *methods* can be carried over into problems of human relationships. It would have been interesting also to know what Professor Bryson thinks of the new dynamic logic and the work in general semantics which is a generalized scientific method. We wonder whether he considers the conventional Aristotelian logic (even if it were taught efficiently) adequate for an age which produced the atomic bomb?

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver

BOOKS AND MATERIALS RECEIVED

The Art of Interpretative Speech. (Third Edition) By CHARLES H. WOOLBERT and SEVERINA E. NELSON. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1945; pp. 588. $2.85.

The Art of Play Production. (Revised Edition) By JOHN DOLMAN, JR. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946; pp. 421. $3.50.

Modern Theatre Practice: A Handbook for Nonprofessionals. (Third Edition) By HUBERT C. HEFFNER, SAMUEL SELDEN, and HUNTON D. SELLMAN, with an appendix on costume and make-up by FAIRFAX PROUDFIT WALKUP. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1946; pp. 501. $3.75.

The New Training for Effective Speech. (Revised Edition) By ROBERT T. OLIVER, RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT, and CYRIL F. HAGER. New York: The Dryden Press, 1946; pp. 414. $2.75.

Anatomy of Racial Intolerance. Compiled by GEORGE DE HUZZAR. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 18, No. 5. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1946; pp. 283. $1.25.

Palestine: Jewish Homeland? Compiled by JULIA E. JOHNSEN. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 18, No. 6. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1946; pp. 342. $1.25.

American Capitalism vs. Russian Communism. Compiled by CLARENCE A. PETERS. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 18, No. 7. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1946; pp. 305. $1.25.

Better Discussion Promotes Democracy: A Discussion Guidebook. By EUGENE C. CHENOWETH. Central Michigan College of Education, Adult Education Publication, 1946; pp. 26.

The Life of King Henry the Fifth. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. Edited by GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE. New York: Ginn and Company, 1945; pp. 211. $0.75.

Radio Drama in Action: Twenty-Five Plays of a Changing World. Edited by ERIK BARNOUW. New York: Farrar and Rinehardt, 1945; pp. 397. $3.00.

Carousel: A Musical Play Based on Molnár's Liliom. By RICHARD ROGERS and OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN II. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945; pp. 178. $2.50.

Phonetic Transcriptions for Better Speech. By LAWRENCE C. MENDENHALL. Boston: Expression Company, 1945; pp. 175.

IN THE PERIODICALS

MARIE HOCHMUTH, *Editor*

BRYSON, LYMAN, "Lincoln in Power," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXI (June, 1946), 161-174.

Bryson states and discusses in terms of Lincoln's experience three tentative declarations about the nature of power: "The first is that the qualities that get men into office by the suffrage of citizens are not identical with those that make for wisdom"; "The second principle is that the exercise of wisdom by one in power, being the philosopher-king, is made extraordinarily difficult by the fact that a man in power spends a large part of his time judging and disposing of the ideas of others instead of conceiving and executing plans of his own"; The third principle is that a man in power must spend most of his time in keeping it; and this might be almost a summary description of Lincoln's experience." Among other things, Bryson discusses Lincoln's full use of his "native gift of eloquence," and his ability to write well if little.

CHENOWETH, EUGENE C., "Better Discussion Promotes Democracy: A Discussion Handbook," Adult Education Publication, Central Michigan College, Extension Press, 1946.

"Because of the increasing importance and tremendous growth of discussion among the great numbers of busy men, women, and youth seeking to preserve the democratic way of life in our nation, there has been an urgent demand for a concise statement of the principles of discussion to meet the needs of these people." Chenoweth presents a brief account of discussion principles and techniques.

EATON, WALTER PRICHARD, "I'll Take This Course," *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXII (Summer, 1946), 394-404.

The writer evaluates his experience with the Harvard elective system, calling particular attention to composition under Lewis E. Gates and speaking under George P. Baker, concluding that the comments of Gates and Baker meant more to me than the words of any other teachers. Eaton laments that public speaking has now seemingly been "abandoned" and argues that it "should be as much insisted on as elementary composition."

GRANT, DAVID K., "The Rise of Audience Participation Programs," *Advertising & Selling*, XXXIX (June, 1946), 45ff.

"A good audience participation program is a decidedly good bet for almost any sponsor. It will get him plenty of listeners, and attentive ones, too, because you can't listen to this type of show and read a book at the same time. Grant discusses the past, present, and probable future of audience particiption programs.

KAPLAN, MILTON, "Radio on the Inoffensive," *Common Ground*, VI (Summer, 1946), 72-77.

"The great powers of radio are being dissipated today on drooling trivialities at a time when the reaffirmation of American democracy is urgently needed to unify a country that even now is at the mercy of dissident elements, who interpret tolerance as weakness and silence as acquiescence." Kaplan discusses the potentialities of radio as a force for combating intolerance and race prejudice.

KEHOE, JOHN E., "Trial Lawyers I Have Known," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, XXXIX (June, 1946), 179-195.

"Many lawyers of an earlier day arouse our admiration because of the marvelously accurate knowledge they had of all branches of law, and their ability to act as counsel in any important legal matter, no matter what its character, and also try any kind of case in court successfully." The author presents personal reminiscences of the skills of downstate Illinois lawyers in the post Civil War period.

KNOWER, FRANKLIN H., "Communcation Skills: Composition, Listening, Radio, Speech, and Related Areas," *Review of Educational Research*, XVI (April, 1946), 116-132.

Research in the field of communication skills "has suffered the fate of most areas of general or liberal education in the period." Knower

reviews studies that have appeared and suggests ten questions in the area of communication skills requiring research that will provide "better answers" than are now being given.

LAVES, WALTER H. C., and FRANCIS O. WILCOX, "The First Meeting of the General Assembly of United Nations," *American Journal of International Law*, XL (April, 1946), 346-373.

"A brief summary of the organization of the Assembly and of its electoral functions is presented, together with a detailed account of the work of the assembly in terms of the activities of the six main committees.

LIND, L. R., "Early Literary Societies at Wabash College," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XLII (June, 1946), 173-176.

"Out of the speaking past the voice of the undergraduate has never failed to be heard." Investigating the ledgers of mid-nineteenth century literary societies at Wabash College, Lind presents an exposition of their activities, emphasizing the discussion and debates characteristic of the period.

MCKEON, RICHARD, "Poetry and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: the Renaissance of Rhetoric," *Modern Philology*, XLIII (May, 1946), 217-234.

McKeon discusses the relationship of poetry and philosophy in the twelfth century and the position of rhetoric as a "connecting link" and methodology for resolving differences.

MCPHERSON, ELIZABETH G., "The Southern States and the Reporting of Senate Debates, 1789-1802," *Journal of Southern History*, XII (May, 1946), 223-246.

"Since the debates of the Senate, with few exceptions, were not reported until the reporters were admitted to the floor of the Senate, beginning on January 5, 1802, the letters of the senators, both official and personal, constitute an important source." McPherson, discussing the role of the public to agitating for the admission of the public to the Senate, accounts for the inadequacy of the *Annals of Congress* between 1789 and 1802, and urges the collection and edition of official and personal letters and journals of the Senators to supplement the accounts of debates which appeared in the often short-lived newspapers of the day.

MORGAN, HENRY, "What's Wrong with Radio 'The Audience!'" *New York Times Magazine* (April 21, 1946), 12ff.

"The people of the radio would love to [illegible] what they know how to do but they won't do [illegible] —unless you listen." The Hooper method of rating is discussed, along with the audience responsibility for the "poor quality" of the programs.

OLD, BRUCE S., "On the Mathematics of Committees, Boards, and Panels," *Scientific Monthly*, LXIII (August, 1946), 129-134.

"The present is considered to be a most appropriate time to study analytically, with a view toward improving, the efficiency of functioning of committees, boards, and panels in general." The writer correlates calculated and actual committee efficiencies and discusses factors affecting committees.

REICHE, BILL, "Telling the World," *Popular Mechanics*, LXXXVI (July, 1946), 148-152ff.

"From Brooklyn to Bombay, the whole world receives day-to-day reports on the United Nations' deliberations via a vast communications network." A report of the roles of the radio and press in reporting proceedings of the United Nations is presented.

SAERCHINGER, CESAR "You're on the Air," *Free World*, XI (April, 1946), 25-27.

"Great as may be the influence of a Walter Lippmann or a Marquis Childs or a Dorothy Thompson, fewer people read their columns than listen to the 'columns' on the air." A widely experienced commentator discusses the role and influence of newscasters, commentators, and news analysts.

SHERWIN, OSCAR, "Sons of Otis and Hancock," *New England Quarterly*, XIX (June, 1946), 212-223.

A record of the speeches of Theodore Parker and Wendell Phillips in defense of the fugitive Anthony Burns is presented in an account of the capture and trial of Burns.

STAUBITZ, ARTHUR D., "The Eloquent Preacher Who Utters No Words," *Magazine Digest*, XXXIII (July, 1946), 85-88.

A report of Cincinnati's actor-pastor evangelist, Reverend Augustus H. Staubitz who "mastered eloquence without sound" and preaches to the deaf mutes, is presented.

WAL[illegible]. RAYMOND, JR., "Spokesman of Frontier Democracy: Albert Gallatin in the Pennsylvania Assembly," *Pennsylvania History*, XIII (Jul[illegible] 1946), 161-184.

Although "Nature had not been exactly generous in bestowing upon Gallatin "the gifts necessary for a great legislative debater," he could become almost eloquent." The writer discusses the legislative career of Gallatin as a foremost leader of the Jeffersonian movement in Pennsylvania.

WELLS, CHARLES F., "Introducing Speakers to an Audience," *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, XXXV (May, 1946), 216-217.

"As leaders in school and community affairs teachers of industrial arts and vocational education are frequently called upon to introduce speakers to an audience." Wells presents a four-point formula to serve as an aid in preparing speeches of introduction.

WOODWARD, JULIAN L., "Public Opinion Polls as an Aid to Democracy," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXI (June, 1946), 238-246.

"If the remedy for the failures of political democracy is more democracy, rather than less, the public opinion poll is an instrument we cannot afford not to make full use of." Woodward discusses the present status of public opinion polling in this country, some technical and economic problems that polls must solve before they can achieve their real usefulness, and their possible future development after they have solved these problems.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

BRIGGS, HAROLD E., and ERNESTINE B. BRIGGS, "The Early Theatre in Chicago," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, XXXIX (June, 1946), 165-178.

"The year 1837 marked both the approval by the state legislature of the charter making the town of Chicago a city and the beginning of theatre there." The writers present the early history of drama in Chicago.

BURN[illegible] WINIFRED, "The Character of Marcius Coriolanus," *Poet Lore*, LII (Spring Issue, 1946), 31-48.

"Although *Cariolanus* has never enjoyed the popularity of either of the other Roman tragedies of the four great tragedies, it is, nevertheless, an admirable work of art." The writer's chief concern is with the character of Marcius Cariolanus, and with the drama as an example of tragedy of character.

HAMILTON, JACK, "The American Negro Theatre," *Dramatics*, XVII (March, 1946), 3, 4.

"In the five years of tumultous life, the American Negro Theatre, located in Harlem, has displayed a resourcefulness and courage that inspire Little Theatre groups everywhere." The writer defines the American Negro Theatre, discusses its aims, and accounts for its success.

HEIBERG-JURGENSEN, KAI, "What Is a Folk-Play?" *Dramatics*, XVII (February, 1946), 3, 4.

"A 'folk-play' is a story of men and women, from all classes of life, engaged in such elementary conflicts as can be recognized, understood, and shared by all spectators in all audiences all over the world." The assistant Director of the Carolina Playmakers defines the folk-play, and discusses its development as "the heart" of the Department of Dramatic Art at the University of North Carolina.

HEWITT, BARNARD, "The Romantic Theatre," *Dramatics*, XVII (February, 1946), 5, 6.

The Romantic theatre, while retaining "much of the Baroque, particularly its splendor of setting and its poetry, brought into theatrical art and ideal of truth to life." Hewitt presents a discussion of the origin and development of the Romantic Theatre.

HEWITT, BARNARD, "The Naturalistic Theatre," *Dramatics*, XVII (March, 1946), 7, 8.

"In the history of the theatre, the Naturalistic Theatre appears as the ultimate realization of of the ideal of illusion which first appeared in the Renaissance." Hewitt traces the development of Naturalism in the theatre from the impetus given by Ibsen to the present.

HEWITT, BARNARD, "The Symbolist Theatre," *Dramatics*, XVII (April, 1946), 5, 6.

"The completely Symbolist play seeks to create an illusion, but it is an illusion of imaginary life or the life of the soul or of the subconscious mind. It does not have the logic of cause and effect or of probability which we associate with everyday life, but it has a logic or consistency of its own, which springs from the playwright's vision of truth." The writer presents the sixth in a series of seven articles on the theatre.

HEWITT, BARNARD, "Epic Theatre," *Dramatics*, XVII (May, 1946), 4, 5.

"Epic Theatre proposes to relate or narrate the actions of men rather than to present or represent them, and although it is not unconcerned with the individual, it is concerned with him only as he is a part of the broad canvas of events." The writer discusses the characteristics of Epic Theatre in the concluding article of a series on "Theatres of Yesterday and Today."

LEES, C. LOWELL, "Seeing the play as a Production." *Dramatics*, XVII (February, 1946), 7, 8.

Continuing a series of articles on learning the art of play production, Lees discusses blocking movements, balancing the set, and preparing the stage for rehearsals.

SUCKLE, THOMAS, "From Foxhole to Footlights," *Saturday Review of Literature*, XXIX (March 16, 1946), 28, 29.

The article presents James Mercer Beasley's plan for the American Theatre. Injured by a Jap bomb, Beasley developed a plan for a producing and acting group which, when it brings its first production to New York, will present Broadway with "a new kind of theatre."

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

BRYANT, MARGARET, "The Fascination of Word Study," *Word Study*, XXI (May, 1946), 4-6.

"The most democratic of all institutions of a democratic people is the English language." Bryant traces the history of the words "seeded" and "nice."

CHAPIN, MIRIAM, "As the Languages Mix," *Asia and the Americas*, XLVI (June, 1946), 260-262.

"In the political world we are seeing emerge a few great powers who take on themselves the responsibility of keeping the peace. In the domain of language, we discover similar groupings who as time goes on find they need two languages, one native and one international—Samoyed and Russian, Mixtec and Spanish, Flemish and French, Gujarati and Hindustani." The writer advances the thesis that "Language can cement what politics builds, if we are wise enough."

DECAMP, L. SPRAGUE, "Learning to Talk," *American Speech*, XXI (February, 1946), 23-28.

Sprague presents an account of the phonetic aspects of how one small boy learned to speak his native English and calls for other studies pertaining to the phonetic development of children, hoping that light might be shed on certain recurrent phenomena in the evolution of language.

HOWELL, A. C., "*Res Et Verba*: Words and Things," *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History*, XIII (June, 1946), 131-142.

The simple pair of words, "words and things" used technically by classical writers on rhetoric "was picked up in the seventeenth century, expanded into a commentary on style, made a rallying cry for the new plain style, adopted by the Royal Society, and was finally laid low by the trenchant pen of Swift. Or was it?" Howell traces through the seventeenth century the use of this combination of words and the idea represented by it and suggests its relationship to the current semantic movement.

KALLEN, HORACE M., "Of the American Spirit," *English Journal*, XXXV (June, 1946), 289-294.

"It is an ancient platitude that a people's arts express its spirit and exemplify its genius far more reliably than any other achievement of a national enterprise. Particularly its literary arts. For the medium of the orator, the poet, the story-teller, the playwright, the essayist, and the philosopher is language." Kallen fears that schools "have missed the vision in seeking the word," and discusses communication as the embodiment of cultural experience.

LABRANT, LOU, "The Words of My Mouth," *English Journal*, XXXV (June, 1946), 323-327.

LaBrant discusses the question, "How do words per se affect our attitudes towards other people, especially members of social groups other than our own, and what can the teacher of English do about this effect?"

MARKWARDT, ALBERT H., "Phonemic Structure and Aural Perception," *American Speech*, XXI (April, 1946), 106-111.

Contrasting the distribution of phones in English and Spanish, the writer raises and answers the question: What effect does this difference in phonemic structure have upon the teaching problem? The importance of the hearing factor in language training is emphasized.

NEVILLE, MARK, "Words Hurt," *English Journal*, XXXV (March, 1946), 134-138.

"The applied skills and techniques of speaking may reflect careful tutoring in high crafts-

manship, but, unless the quality of the idea expressed is high, all the hours spent in polishing the apple of speech will have been wasted on a rotten apple." The writer urges the importance of teaching the "meaning of meaning" and the exertion of effort to reduce prejudices resulting from the use of powerful words.

TRAGER, GEORGE L., "Changes of Emphasis in Linguistics," *Studies in Philology*, XLIII (July, 1946), 461-464.

"In the opinion of many of us, linguistics is a basic and most important field of social science, and only the scientific development of these fields can help solve the world's problems. By clarifying our own ideas of our work we may perhaps—even though indirectly or remotely—clarify ideas in the larger, more 'practical' fields of applied psychology." The writer takes opposition to some aspects of the survey of the recent history of linguistics by George S. Lane, particularly the position of Bloomfield "as the one name around whom to center descriptive linguistics as contrasted wih the older historical techniques."

YOUNG, G. M., "Basic," *S. P. E.*, Tract No. LXII, Oxford University Press, 1946.

"Basic is an attempt to construct a code-language out of English. And its authors begin, one may say, by standing the real language on its head; or, perhaps, turning it inside out." Young presents a case against the utility of Basic.

SPEECH SCIENCE

CARHART, RAYMOND, "Individual Differences in Hearing for Speech," *Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, LV (June, 1946), 233-266.

Carhart reports an investigation on individual differences in relative acuity for speech reception stimuli and for pure tones, designed to clarify the incidence and significance of these individual differences as they were observed among hard of hearing patients reaching a military program for Aural Rehabilitation at Deshon General Hospital.

HARRINGTON, ROBERT, "A Note on a Lingua-Velar Relationship," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XI (March, 1946), 25.

Previous investigations would suggest that "a positive relationship between tongue and velar heights during phonation" exists. Harrington suggests, however, that adequate controls had not been established, and calls for re-study by X-ray technique.

IRWIN, ORVIS C., and HAN PIAO CHEN, "Infant Speech: Vowel and Consonant Frequency," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XI (June, 1946), 123-125.

In a study of 1,622 records transcribed in the International Phonetic Alphabet from the spontaneous speech of 95 infants throughout a period of 2.5 years, the investigators report an analysis of the frequency of vowel and consonant utterance, indicate the equations derived from the data, and present curves of development representative of the equations.

KNOWER, FRANKLIN H., and MARJORIE EMERSON, "Indices of Achievement in Voice Instruction," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XI (June, 1946), 159-163.

The writers present a study whose focal purpose was to analyze certain problems in the measurement of improvement in vocal skills as the result of voice instruction.

LEVINSON, NATHAN, "What Sound Hath Wrought -I," *Scientific Monthly*, LXIII (August, 1946), 101-109.

The modern sound motion picture is a "hybrid of developments in such fields as electronics, acoustics, chemistry, mechanics, optics, and metallurgy." The development of sound motion pictures is discussed.

LIERLE, D. M., and SCOTT N. REGER, "Correlations Between Bone and Air Conduction Acuity Measurements Over Wide Frequency Ranges in Different Types of Hearing Impairments," *Laryngoscope*, LVI (May, 1946), 187-224.

The writers present an analysis of the results of threshold measurements from 128 to 8,192 cycles of both the bone and air conduction acuity of patients with various types of ear lesions.

PERLMAN, H. B., "A Sound Source for the Otologist," *Laryngoscope*, LVI (July, 1946), 360-366.

The article discusses limitations imposed upon the study of the function of various parts of the peripheral ear because of a lack of necessary tools and techniques and describes a sound source that delivers its acoustic energy through stethoscope tubing to the patient's ear.

"Sounds Changed into Visual Patterns by New Device in Bell Laboratory," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (May, 1946), 201-204.

Bell Laboratory's instrument for translating sound into visual patterns shows "three dimensions of sound—frequency, time, and intensity—on a screen to be read by the eye." Some uses of the instrument are discussed.

TSCHIASSNY, KURT, "Tuning Fork Tests," *Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, LV (June, 1946), 423-430.

"In spite of many objections, the Weber, Rinne and Schwabach tests have proved themselves to be the most valuable methods for differential diagnosis between conduction and perception deafness." The writer presents a historical review of tuning fork tests.

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

ADAMS, HARLEN M., "Speech Activities in the Secondary School," *English Journal*, XXXV (March, 1946), 129-133.

Since speech is our most effective means of social communication, "it is imperative in a democracy that provision be made for the optimum development of the speech of all students." The writer suggests a program of training for "certain abilities and appreciations," and offers a series of propositions as a frame of reference for planning speech program for the secondary schools.

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., "Behavior Patterns of College Teachers," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXX (July-August, 1946), 484-490.

"Speech peculiarities are disturbing to many students." Collecting information for the last fifteen years from graduate students and alumni concerning the reactions to college teachers, the writer presents an exposition of his findings. Seven desirable traits are listed, and undesirable traits are discussed in detail.

BORCHERS, GLADYS L., "The Speech Arts Laboratory," *School Executive*, LXV (July, 1946), 46, 47.

"An adequate speech program should include individual training for all students, and extra curricular experiences and public performances for the gifted. Such a plan for a school at 300 to 500 students requires the time of approximately three full time teachers." Borchers recommends plans for such training for a well-equipped high school plant.

COOK, LUELLA B., "Teaching Grammar and Usage in Relation to Speech and Writing," *English Journal*, XXXV (April, 1946), 188-1[illegible]

As a result of a focused observation of language practice, the writer presents a functional approach to language improvement or correctness in a series of exercises.

ENSLIN, FRANCIS I., "Radio for the Small High School," *Dramatics*, XVII (May, 1946), [illegible]

"Radio is an activity which is a valuable adjunct to dramatics, and more than that, an indispensable part of a modern program of education in its own right, and one entirely practical for the small school." The writer presents the story of the uses four high schools in Connecticut have made of radio.

HERZBERG, MAX J., "Radio: Three Plus Three," *School Activities*, XVII (March, 1946), 261

"There are three misunderstandings of one sort that impair the use of radio in the schools and there are three misunderstandings of another sort that sometimes discourage teachers from even trying it." Herzberg discusses difficulties encountered in introducing radio into the school.

HOLMES, F. LINCOLN D., "The Contribution of the Speech Re-education Clinic to Teacher Preparation," *Teachers College Journal*, XVII (May, 1946), 104-106.

Mr. Holmes explains some of the procedures by which improvement is effected in the speech correction clinic conducted under his direction at Illinois State Normal. Four topics are developed: 1) service for the student preparing to teach; 2) services for pupils in training school and in affiliated schools; 3) out-patient service and 4) the speech re-education clinic.

HOWARD, HELEN L., "Speech Games for Grade Children," *Progressive Teacher*, LIII (May, 1946), 20-23.

"Since all speech is accomplished by muscles carving our voices into words, the training of these muscles is most important for good voice and diction. The basis for all good use of the voice is relaxation." Various relaxation and breathing exercises are presented.

LUND, MARY GRAHAM, "Expanding the High School Theatre," *Dramatics*, XVII (May, 1946), 6, 7.

To be of use, the high school theatre "must be made truly democratic. It cannot be viewed as a means of entertainment or of making mon-

ey, as a training ground for the professionl stage, or as a means of advancing the prestige of the school." The writer discusses the use of the high school theatre for "remedial" purposes, for purposes of bringing about "inter-racial understanding," and for cultivating "free expression."

"Preaching," *Speech Fellowship News Letter*, XXVII (March, 1946), 3.

The article calls attention to the booklet, *Towards the Conversion of England*, issued by the Board of the Church Assembly, indicating that the "standard of preaching throughout the Church, speaking generally, is deplorably low." The writer makes recommendations for speech training for the clergy.

RAY, PAULINE DAHNKE, "A Program for Extra-curricular Speech Activities." *School Activities*, XVII (February, 1946), 204-206ff.

The Lutcher Stark Senior High School and the Carr Junior High School of Orange, Texas have inaugurated a new speech arts program "which is meeting with far-reaching results." "There are four points of emphasis in this program: first, to provide an opportunity for those eager but average boys and girls who are usually left out in the search for outstanding talent which goes on in most schools preparatory to a program; second, to provide a program which will challenge this more talented, experienced group; third, to correlate the work of the Speech Arts Department with that of other departments in the school; fourth, to establish a closer relationship between the school and the community by providing entertainment for civic groups, for federal housing areas, and for neighboring schools who send students by bus to Orange." The program is outlined.

RICHARDSON, ANNE, "How the Secondary Teacher Can Stimulate Thinking," *Progressive Teacher*, LIII (May, 1946), 10-12.

"As much as some educators seem to deny the importance of oral English, we must admit that speech is one of the most important mediums by which thought is conveyed, and has such a peculiarly intimate connection with thought that I believe it should require some special consideration in teaching situations." The writer discusses problem solving situations and techniques as means for stimulating thinking.

SAUNDERS, JAMES PERKINS, "Radio Communication Training in High Schools," *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, XXXV (March, 1946), 130-134.

"Those who should know are agreed that the future of radio and electronics hold great promise. If so should not our secondary schools be ready to give students the necessary training?" The article describes a successful training program which is being carried on at the Northbridge senior and junior high schools, Whitinsville, Massachusetts.

"Speech Work in Emergency Training College," *Speech Fellowship News Letter*, XXVI (January, 1946), 1.

The article records the recommendations of the British Ministry of Education to the Emergency Training Colleges for training teachers to speak effectively.

STEVENS, KELLY H., "Finger Painting for Little Deaf Children," *Volta Review*, XLVIII (August, 1946), 445-447ff.

The Louisiana School for the Deaf is "not inclined to give much credence to the psychological hocus-pocus with which psychiatrists have invested" finger painting, "but we do know, from long and practical experience, that it is a very effective means of drawing out the faculties of little children and aiding their mental and manual growth via the free play technique." Stevens presents a detailed discussion of finger painting.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

CANTRIL, HADLEY, "The Intensity of an Attitude," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLI (April, 1946), 129-135.

"Attitude studies to date have, in general, not distinguished clearly between what might be called the intensity of opinion, as contrasted to its direction or extent." Cantril's study presents a distinction between the intensity of an attitude and its direction and determines the relationship of the two variables.

CUTLER, MAX, "Cancer of the Larynx," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XLIII (April, 1946), 315-330.

"Modern radiation therapy is an increasingly effective method of treatment for laryngeal cancer." A study of 118 patients with cancer of the larynx who were treated by irradiation in the Chicago Tumor Institute from 1938 to 1942 is presented.

FROESCHELS, EMIL, "Cluttering," *Journal of Speech Disorders*," XI (March, 1946), 31-33.

"Verbal expression is dependent upon two phases, namely the attitude toward expressing a thought and the choice of words." Defining cluttering as an incongruity occurring between the urge to utter an idea, on the one hand, and the thought accomplishment and the speech accomplishment, on the other, Froeschels discusses symptoms and therapy of cluttering.

HOLLENDER, A. R., "The Nasopharynx: A Study of 140 Autopsy Specimens," *Laryngoscope*, LVI (June, 1946), 282-304.

"Neither the rhinologist nor the pathologist has taken advantage of available material, autopsy and clinical, for careful investigation and study of the nasopharynx." Dr. Hollender's primary object was to record the pathologic findings in 140 autopsy specimens of the nasopharynx. Anatomy, histology, and pathologic findings are discussed.

HULSE, WILLIAM F., "Treatment of Tuberculosis of the Larynx," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XLIII (June, 1946), 578-585.

Among the various complications of tuberculosis, "none has received more universal attention than the complication laryngeal tuberculosis. In spite of this fact, a review of its incidence as represented in the literature reveals a striking spread in percentages." The writer discusses therapy.

JENSEN, CAROL M., "The Place of the Cerebral-Palsied Child in the Public School," *California Journal of Elementary Education*, XIV (May, 1946), 205-212.

Recent legislation in the State of California has enabled the departments of education and public health to make a beginning toward a solution of the problem of the care of California's eight thousand cerebral-palsied children. The article discusses the program of State aid.

JONES, MARGARET H., "The Cerebral Palsy Child," *American Journal of Nursing*, XLVI (July, 1946), 465-468.

"The progress and success of the treatment of the cerebral palsy patient depends in the final analysis, not on the physician, teacher, physiotherapist or occupational therapist, but on the effort of the cerebral palsy patient himself." Dr. Jones presents a comprehensive discussion of diagnosis and treatment, including speech involvement.

KERR, MARION, "Nursing Responsibilities in Cerebral Palsy," *American Journal of Nursing*, XLVI (July, 1946), 469-474.

"For a better understanding of the patient with cerebral palsy, we must consider his situation as compared with that of the normal person." Among other things, the writer discusses the role of the nurse in speech therapy for the palsied child.

LAVOS, GEORGE, and EARL W. JONES, "The Deaf Worker in Industry," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (March, 1946), 154-176.

The writers present one of the first attempts at objective evaluation of the efficiency of the deaf in Industry. In a study of 56 deaf workers in a war plant, investigators secured information on three aspects of a deaf worker's efficiency at his job: ability to produce, ability to adjust socially, and ability to minimize the defect, concluding that "If deafness played a role in the efficiency of these workers it must have been one of compensation rather than handicap."

LEDERER, FRANCIS L., and WILLIAM G. HARDY, "Treatment and Training of the Hard of Hearing," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XLIII (May, 1946), 429-461.

The Naval Program of Speech and Hearing Rehabilitation at the United States Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, dedicated to the psychosocial adjustment of the handicapped person and planned to achieve optimal retraining for communication within a four to eight week period, has thus far processed almost 3,000 aural casualties and "furnishes ample data for transferring principles and methods to civilian hearing problems." The writers describe the work in detail.

LEFFORD, ARTHUR, "The Influence of Emotional Subject Matter on Logical Reasoning," *Journal of General Psychology*, XXXIV (April, 1946), 127-150.

In an experimental attempt to show the influence of the affective processes of the personality on the reasoning processes, the writer found that "most subjects solve neutrally toned syllogisms more correctly than emotionally toned syllogisms, and that there was little relationship between the ability to reason accurately in non-emotional and emotional situations."

MAAS, OTTA, "On the Aetiology of Stuttering," *Journal of Mental Science (The British Journal of Psychiatry)*, XCII (April, 1946), 357-363.

"Stuttering is not a disease, but a symptom of

various disorders in the nervous system." The writer reviews the literature of the field and discusses etiology.

MARTIN, LT. COL. NORVIL A., "Psychogenic Deafness," *Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, LV (March, 1946), 81-87.

In a study of 1500 patients admitted for deafness to the Hearing Center at Hoff General Hospital, Santa Barbara, California, "a large number of patients were found to have deafness on a psychogenic basis." Methods of diagnosis and therapy are discussed.

MYKLEBUST, HELMER R., "A Study of the Usefulness of Objective Measures of Mechanical Aptitude in Guidance Programs for the Hypacoustic, I," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (March, 1946), 123-150.

Myklebust presents a study to evaluate the usefulness of objective measures of mechanical aptitude in guidance programs for those with impaired hearing.

MYKLEBUST, HELMER R., "A Study of the Usefulness of Objective Measures of Mechanical Aptitude in Guidance Programs for the Hypacoustic, II," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (May, 1946), 205-225.

The writer presents conclusions derived from a study designed to evaluate the usefulness of objective measures of mechanical aptitude in guidance programs for those with impaired hearing.

MYKLEBUST, HELMER R., "Significance of Etiology in Motor Performance of Deaf Children with Special Reference to Meningitis," *American Journal of Psychology*, LIX (April, 1946), 249-258.

"Little attention has been given to the etiology of deafness and its relation to motor performance, learning problems or adjustment." The writer tries to determine by experiment whether differences in motor ability might exist between deaf children classified etiologically.

PATTEN, HELEN T., "Fitting the Young Hard of Hearing Child for School Through Auditory Approach," *Journal of School Health*, XVI (May, 1946), 139-141.

The writer presents the program for the rehabilitation of the hard of hearing in use at the Winthrop Foundation of the Eye and Ear Infirmary at Boston, Massachusetts.

PEACHER, WILLIAM G., and GEORGIANA M. PEACHER, "Speech Disorders in World War II," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CIII May, 1946), 484-493.

"The study of speech disorders has been largely neglected by the medical profession with the exception of the dysphasias." The writers present a series of examinations for routine testing of the dysarthrias and dyslalias, which "have been of considerable value in the diagnosis of these disorders of articulation in the Speech Clinic at McGuire General Hospital."

POSTMAN, LEO, "The Time-Error in Auditory Perception," *American Journal of Psychology*, LIX (April, 1946), 193-219.

Postman's study represents a "new attempt to conceptualize the time-error in terms of physiological processes." Three series of experiments are presented testing the hypothesis advanced "that there should be a minimum of time error in substitutive discriminations (judgments of pitch) and a significant time-error in additive discriminations (judgments of loudness)."

QUINN, JOSEPHINE, "First Year's Language Work," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (March, 1946), 177-189.

"In presenting language as in presenting any other subject it is necessary to have the undivided attention and interest of the class." A language program for the beginning deaf child is presented.

SCHLESINGER, EDWARD B., "Use of Curare in Oil in Treatment of Spasticity Following Injury of the Spinal Cord," *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, LV (May, 1946), 530-534.

The writer reports "good relaxation of muscle spasm of up to three days' duration" resulted from treatment of a group of patients showing intense spasticity accompanying injury to the spinal cord with aqueous solutions of curare.

SCHULZ, LOIS R., "A Study of the Educational Facilities in California for Children with Cerebral Palsy," *Journal of Experimental Education*, XIV (June, 1946), 267-296.

In an investigation of the educational facilities for crippled children in the State of California, it was found that there is "needed an integrated program to provide the children with the necessary physical training for development of those motor skills without which academic learnings are not functional, and that there were "few teachers in California schools who were trained for instructing children with cerebral palsy."

NEWS AND NOTES

OTA THOMAS, *Editor*

READER'S DIGEST OFFERS NEW EDUCATIONAL SERVICE

The Educational Department of *Reader's Digest* is supplying, free of charge, to lay and professional groups the services of its Reading Consultant and Demonstrator, Margaret E. Crowley.

The current trend in reading that places emphasis upon the need for continued teaching of reading skills at the junior and senior high school levels, the integration of reading with the language arts, and the reading disabilities that cause students to fail their school courses are problems that confront all school administrators today.

Miss Crowley brings to this field of service a knowledge of the problems that exist in reading and in the language arts on the junior and senior high school levels. Her services are available to schools of the East for consultations, demonstrations and meetings with teachers, supervisors, and administrators concerning their current reading programs. She will demonstrate to teachers approved methods of instruction in reading, as well as act as speaker or consultant.

Appointments may be made through Arthur J. Crowley, Director, Educational Department, *Reader's Digest*, 353 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y.

• • •

NEW APPOINTMENTS

James F. Curtis this fall assumed his duties as Associate Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa. He will teach primarily in the field of experimental phonetics. Lt. Curtis recently returned from China where he served as a member of a Naval Commission. Prior to the war he was on the staff of Purdue University.

• • •

Hunton D. Sellman has been appointed head of the Department of Dramatic Art at San Diego State Teachers College, San Diego, California.

Walter Dewey has succeeded Mr. Sellman as teacher of stage lighting at the State University of Iowa.

Miss Andrea Hetzel has been appointed to the staff of the theatre at the University of Minnesota.

• • •

Jonathan W. Cuervin has been appointed project associate in the work of the "Wisconsin Idea" Theatre, directed by Robert Gard at the University of Wisconsin.

• • •

Winston Brembeck has been appointed Acting Instructor at the University of Wisconsin for 1946-1947. Mr. Brembeck will have charge of the intercollegiate forensic program during the year.

• • •

David Phillips has resigned from the staff of Stephens College to accept an assistant professorship in the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

• • •

Evelyn Seedorf is moving from Colby Junior College to a position at the University of Denver.

• • •

Wynette Barnett is moving from her position at Syracuse University to the State Teachers College, Whitewater, Wisconsin, where she becomes Dean of Women and Assistant Professor of Speech.

• • •

Marion Robinson has accepted a position at Goucher College for the coming year.

• • •

Paul Boomsliter has been appointed to the speech staff of Cornell University.

• • •

Robert Huber, who taught at the University of Wisconsin during the 1946 summer semester, has been appointed to the staff of the University of Vermont.

• • •

Melvin White has been appointed to the staff of the University of Wyoming for the coming year.

• • •

Grace Ingledue has been elected to an assistant professorship in interpretation and radio at the University of Southern California.

Margaret Thomson, formerly at Carleton College, has been added to the staff at Indiana University. She will teach acting, directing, and a new course in costuming.

Mary B. Mann has been added to the Indiana staff to assist with the foreign students' program of the speech clinic.

Other new instructors at Indiana University include Raymond G. Smith, public speaking; Robert H. Lee, radio; Richard L. Scammon, scene design; and Donald H. Horton, who will serve as Manager of the Auditorium and public speaking instructor. All of these men served during the war with the Armed Forces and have just returned to the teaching profession.

• • •

Additions to the speech staff at the University of Michigan include George Kopp and Harriet Green, formerly associated with the Bell Telephone Laboratories; D. E. Morley, formerly affiliated with the Acoustic Rehabilitation Service of the Philadelphia Naval Hospital and recently in charge of the Hearing Conservation Program of the State of Pennsylvania; Charles Lightfoot of Northwestern University; Jane Beasley of Grosse Pointe Public Schools; and Wallace Garneau of Western Michigan College of Education.

• • •

George B. Linn and George F. Sparks are new instructors in the Department of Speech of the University of Arizona. Mr. Linn has been a superintendent of schools in Oregon for the past five years. Mr. Sparks comes to Arizona from the University of Miami at Coral Gables, Florida.

• • •

Carroll C. Arnold has recently joined the speech staff at Cornell University. Before his war service with the Army he was located at the Pennsylvania College for Women.

• • •

New members of the Department of Speech and Drama at the University of Southern California are: Grant Fairbanks from the State University of Iowa, who, as a Captain in the Army, served as Chief of the Aural Rehabilitation Section of the Borden General Hospital, Chickasha, Oklahoma; W. Charles Redding from the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington; and James Harmon Butler from San Jose State College, San Jose, California.

Willard T. Friederich has been appointed Assistant Professor of Dramatics and Speech at Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio. He was formerly on the faculty of Carroll College, Waukesha, Wisconsin.

• • •

J. T. Daniel of the University of Denver has been appointed Director of Debate at the University of Alabama.

• • •

Three additions have been made to the faculty of the School of Speech at Northwestern University: Stanley Donner, Assistant Professor of Radio, who recently returned from service as a Commander in the Navy; Martin Maloney, Assistant Professor of Radio, who served as a Marine Lieutenant during the war; and Ida Mae Goe, Instructor in Dramatic Production, who comes to Northwestern from Gulf Park College.

• • •

Theodore Nelson has left Allegheny College to accept a position at St. Olaf College.

• • •

William E. Utterback has resigned his position at the City College of New York in order to accept an associate professorship in speech at Ohio State University.

• • •

PERSONALS

Peter Marroney of the Department of Dramatic Arts in the University of Arizona, who was on war leave in the Navy, has returned to his teaching this fall. During his absence, Lucy Barton was the acting head of the department.

• • •

During the past summer session, W. Arthur Cable, of the Department of Speech at the University of Arizona taught biolinguistic phonetics in the University of Denver and did further graduate work.

• • •

William Halstead and Robert Mellencamp have returned to the staff of the University of Michigan from service in the Armed Forces.

• • •

Mrs. Elaine Pagel Paden has resigned her position at the University of Maryland.

• • •

Richard Moody returned to Indiana University as a member of the speech staff after an absence of three years, during which he served with the Armed Forces and engaged in professional radio work.

• • •

Gladys Borchers has been granted a leave of absence from the Department of Speech at the University of Wisconsin for the academic year 1946-1947. She will replace Claude M. Wise on

the staff at Louisiana State University while he in turn replaces Bower Aly at the University of Missouri.

• • •

A. T. Weaver of the University of Wisconsin spent the summer as visiting profesor in the Department of Speech at the University of California, Berkeley, California.

• • •

H. L. Ewbank of the University of Wisconsin has just been elected first vice-president of the American Association of University Professors to succeed the late Professor Pelzer of the State University of Iowa.

• • •

Girard Chester has been granted a Kaltenborn fellowship in radio at the University of Wisconsin for the academic year 1946-1947. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn recently has added $5000 to his initial gift of $10,000 to provide funds for this fellowship.

• • •

John Boyt of the State University of Iowa has been employed by Theatre, Inc., and Guthrie McClintic to design *Playboy of the Western World* and the new Hardwicke show in New York next season.

• • •

George Sargent has returned to the Department of Speech and Dramatics of the University College of Arts and Pure Science at New York University from services in the Armed Forces.

• • •

Bert Hanson of the University of Montana was a visiting lecturer at the University of Denver during the past summer.

• • •

Ruth Haun of the University of Pittsburgh presented work at the University of Denver during the summer terms.

• • •

Elwood Murray of the School of Speech at the University of Denver was a visiting lecturer at Indiana State Teachers College during the first summer term.

• • •

Four members of the Northwestern School of Speech faculty have returned from war service; they are Raymond Carhart, Irving J. Lee, Lee Mitchell, and Ernest J. Wrage. All of them served with the Army, Mr. Carhart as a Captain, and the others as Majors.

Isaac Brackett and Paul Moore have also returned to the School of Speech from civilian service with the Voice Communications Laboratory of the Army Air Forces at Waco, Texas.

Domis E. Plugge of Hunter College was a visiting member of the speech staff of Teachers College, Columbia University, during the summer term.

• • •

PROFESSIONAL

Visiting members of the Department of Speech at the University of Michigan for the 1946 summer session were: Claribel B. Baird of Oklahoma College for Women; Miss Lucy Burton of the University of Arizona; Tom C. Battin of the Dayton (Ohio) Public Schools; Winston H. Beaven of Union College; Frederic O. Crandall and Olive L. Crandall of Mississippi State College for Women; Dean N. Currie of Mt. Holyoke College; Vincent Jukes of Ohio University; Adeline E. McClelland of Purdue University; Charles J. McGaw of Ohio State University; Charles H. Meredith of Le Petit Theatre du Vieux Carre, New Orleans; James W. Moll of the University of Texas; D. E. Morley of the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction; Upton S. Palmer of Bowling Green State University; Raymond H. Pedersen of Cedar Falls (Iowa) Public Schools; Herbert Philippi of the University of Missouri; Westley Rowland of Alma College; Charlotte M. Skene of Bowling Green State University; Ilah G. Smith of Owosso (Michigan) Public Schools.

• • •

The Department of Speech at the University of Michigan held a Conference and Reunion on the University campus August 16 and 17. Among the speakers at the Conference were W. Norwood Brigance, President of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA; George Kopp of Bell Telephone Laboratories; and G. Emerson Markham and Helen T. Rhodes of the General Electric television station at Schenectady. The program included a special performance of *The Bartered Bride*, a demonstration debate on the national high school question, and a speech correction demonstration. During the conference an exhibit was held of the most recent speech texts, teaching materials, recording machines, phonographs, and projectors.

The Department of Speech of the University of Michigan announces the transfer of the Visible Speech project of the Bell Telephone Laboratories to Ann Arbor. The research, to be continued in cooperation with the Bell Telephone Laboratories, will be carried at the University Speech Clinic and at the Rackham School of Special Education of the Michigan State Normal College at Ypsilanti. The Bell Telephone Laboratories will provide the basic

equipment developed for the translation of acoustical phenomena into visible interpretable patterns. The experimental work in the application of visible speech to the speech and language training for the deaf already begun by the Bell Telephone Laboratories will be continued on a much expanded scale, and the study of other uses of sound patterns will be commenced immediately.

The Department of Speech at Michigan is expanding its work in hearing rehabilitation through the establishment of a service of fitting hearing aids for hard-of-hearing persons. The program will provide for otological examination, audiometric and functional tests of hearing, selection of a suitable hearing aid, training in the use of the aid, lip-reading, speech training, and consultation on special problems of the patient.

• • •

A round table for the discussion of aims and methods of the communications skills course was held at the State University of Iowa on June 27-28, 1946. Invitations were sent to a limited number of persons who are engaged in experimental work in communication skills. Discussions were led by members of the Iowa staff; Porter Perrin, Colgate University; Lennox Grey, Columbia University; and Paul Bagwell, Michigan State College. Members of the Iowa staff who took part were John Gerber, James Stroud, Wendell Johnson, A. Craig Baird, Harold Crain, Wayne Britton, Tom Lewis, Hayes Newby, Gladys Lynch, Carrie Stanley, Bartholow Crawford, Alexander Kearn, Paul Blommers, and E. C. Mabie.

• • •

The seventeenth Rocky Mountain Speech Conference will be held at the University of Denver on February 13, 14, 15, 1947. The college and high school forensics and discussion sections will employ the national debate questions as themes. The panel of leaders in speech and communications education who will participate will be announced at a later date.

• • •

The Eastern Public Speaking Conference held its 34th meeting in New York City on April 26 and 27, 1946. It was the first meeting since 1942 and approximately 200 attended. The following officers were elected:

Joseph F. O'Brien, Pennsylvania State College, President

Frances B. Tibbits, Newark Public Schools, Vice-President

Marvin Bauer, Brooklyn College, Secretary-Treasurer

Vera Sickles, Smith College, Executive Committee Member (2 years)

Karl R. Wallace, University of Virginia, Executive Committee Member (one year)

Arthur Woehl, Hunter College, Executive Committee, *ex-officio*

John H. Frizzell, Pennsylvania State College, Executive Committee, *ex-officio*.

A permanent committee on the Conference Archives was appointed, to cooperate with the Committee on the History of Speech Education of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, to complete the files of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, and to secure a repository. Members of the committee are: George V. Bohman, Dartmouth College, chairman; Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University; Lester Thonssen, City College of the City of New York; and John H. Frizzell, Pennsylvania State College. Any persons possessing correspondence, minutes, financial reports, or old programs of the Conference are requested to communicate with the chairman.

A resolution was adopted by rising vote expressing the esteem in which the Conference held the late Professor Hoyt H. Hudson, one-time president of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference.

The 35th conference will meet at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, April 18 and 19, 1947.

• • •

The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech met at the Atlanta Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta, March 19-23, 1946. In conjunction with the meeting the annual speech tournament and student congress was held under the direction of Charles McGlon; representatives of 21 colleges and high schools took part.

The Association approved a change in its name and will now be known as the Southern Speech Association. Officers for the year 1946-1947 were elected: President, Hazel Abbott, Converse College; First Vice-President, Lester Hale, University of Florida; Second Vice-President, Christine Drake, Alexandria, Louisiana; Third Vice-President, Charles McGlon, Baptist Theological Seminary; Executive Secretary, George F. Totten, Southwestern at Memphis; Editor of the *Southern Speech Journal*, Claude Shaver.

The Association will hold its next convention at the Heidelberg Hotel, Baton Rouge, April 8-12, 1947.

THEATRE

The Black Hills Playhouse, a summer theatre group, has been organized by Warren M. Lee, director in the theatre at the University of Iowa. The Playhouse was opened in the State Game Lodge in western South Dakota in the first week in June. All members of the group were students at Iowa, former dramatics students who have obtained their degrees, or persons who have been connected with the University Theatre. The group presented about 50 performances during their 10-week session. Hits such as *Claudia*, *Trouble-Shooter*, and *Papa Is All* were presented at the Game Lodge and in Hot Springs, Custer, Rapid City, Sturgis, Lead, Deadwood, Spearfish, and other cities. The Black Hills Playhouse venture came at the close of a season in which an estimated 10,000 persons saw the 68 performances produced by the University Theatre in 237 days.

During the 1946 summer session, B. Iden Payne, formerly director of the Stratford-on-the Avon festival company, was guest director at the State University of Iowa Theatre. He produced two Shakespearean plays, *Julius Ceasar* and *Taming of the Shrew*. Vance Morton directed a production of *I Remember Mama*. Technical work on these presentations was supervised by Arnold S. Gillette, H. D. Sellman, and Berneice Prisk. In the experimental theatre, a series of original one-acts was produced under the direction of Marion Galloway.

The experimental series of the Theatre at Iowa will open this fall with a new manuscript by Richard Maibaum entitled *Appennine Grape*, under the direction of E. C. Mabie. The community series opened on November 2, with a production of *The Late George Apley*, under the direction of Vance Morton.

• • •

During the 1945-46 season the Illini Theatre Guild at the University of Illinois effected two interesting revivals from the classic drama — Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Euripides' *Alcestis*, both of which were produced on reconstructed "original" stagings. The Guild's Globe staging, modelled according to the specifications of John Adams *Globe Playhouse*, has now been used for three consecutive annual productions, and will be used again in February, 1947, for *Antony and Cleopatra*. The *Alcestis* (in the Fitts-Fitzgerald translation) was provided with a double chorus — a speaking chorus operating on stage level, and a dancing chorus playing below in an "orchestra" obtained by the removal of several rows of auditorium seats. The scen wall was adapted from Bulle's famous reco struction of the classical Skene. Other plays last season were *Three Men on a Horse*, *Begg on Horseback*, *Pirates of Penzance*, *Blithe Spir* and *Six Characters in Search of an Auth* besides about a dozen shorter plays produce in the new Laboratory Theatre.

• • •

The summer playbill at the University Wisconsin included *The Damask Cheek*, directe by Kurt Denmark; *Blithe Spirit*, directed Mary Latimer; *Little Foxes*, directed by Joh Dietrich; and *Angel Street* directed by Frederic Buerki. The summer season consisted of fou performances of each play and was completel sold out on a season ticket basis.

• • •

This fall, Indiana University began activitie in a newly completed Studio Theatre. Emphasi will be on the production of new scripts, and cuttings from plays giving particular experienc in the various styles of acting and production. This new theatre will give additional practical training to persons interested in acting and directing and help provide facilities for the increased number of students expected to enroll this fall.

Indiana opened the 1946-1947 season with a repeat performance of *Macbeth*. Other productions scheduled for the coming season are *Time of Your Life*, *I Remember Mama*, *The Drunkard*, *Wuthering Heights*, *Rain*, The Jordan River Revue (student-written musical), and *The Rivals*. The last was chosen as the classical play to be presented for the general convocation series and early next summer for the National Drama Conference which will meet at Bloomington.

• • •

PROMOTIONS

Kenneth G. Hance has been appointed Assistant Dean of the School of Speech, Northwestern University.

• • •

Alan Coutts has been appointed Director of Student Personnel for the University College and the College of Engineering at New York University. In addition to his new duties he will retain his status in the speech department.

• • •

Orville Pence has completed his graduate work since his discharge from the Navy, and has been made an Assistant Professor at the University of Washington.

AMONG THE CONTRIBUTORS

THOMAS E. COULTON: *Are We Isolationists?* (A. B., College of the City of New York; A. M., Columbia; Ph. D., New York University) is Professor of Speech at Brooklyn College where he has been teaching since the founding of that institution in 1930. Since 1942 he has served also as Coordinator for Veterans. He is Director of the Brooklyn College Veteran's Advisement Unit; and in September 1946, assumed the duties of Director of the Evening Session. He has contributed to the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH and to *Educational Method*, and is author of *A Manual for Freshman Speech Courses*.

DOUGLAS EHNINGER: *Bernard Lami's "L'Art de Parler: A Critical Analysis* (B. S., A. M., Northwestern) is Assistant Professor of Speech at The George Washington University. He has published material in the JOURNAL, the *Gavel*, and the *Southern Speech Bulletin*. His major scholarly interest is in sixteenth and seventeenth century French rhetoric.

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF: *John Quincy Adams* (A. M., Ph. D., Iowa) is Professor of Speech at the University of Washington. Mr. Rahskopf is a past president of the Western Association of Teachers of Speech and for a number of years has been active on various committees of the Speech Association of America. In 1937 he was chairman of a committee which prepared *An Integrated Course of Study in Speech* for the Washington State Department of Public Instruction.

EUGENE E. WHITE: *Mississippi's Great White Chief* (B. S., Oregon State; A. M., Louisiana State) is a member of the speech staff at Louisiana State University. He has published articles in the *Southern Speech Journal* and in the *Journal of Mississippi History*. For his dissertation Mr. White is preparing a critical study of George Whitefield.

GILES WILKESON GRAY: *The "Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep"* (A. B., DePauw; A. M., Wisconsin; Ph. D., Iowa) is Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University. Most readers will remember Mr. Gray as author of *The Bases of Speech* (with C. M. Wise) and of many articles in various journals. He was editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL for the term, 1939-41, and is now Chairman of the ASSSOCIATION'S Committee on the History of Speech Education.

ROBERT F. RAY: *The Iowa University Student Senate* (A. B., Coe; A. M., Iowa) is a research assistant in the Department of Speech at the University of Iowa; at Iowa also he is the current manager of forensic programs.

GEORGE McCOY MUSGRAVE: *The Double-Summary Technique in Debate* (S. B., Massachusetts Institute of Technology) is at present the Production Control Manager, Solar Precision Castings, in the Solar Aircraft Company at Des Moines, Iowa. He is also an associate editor of the *Debater's Magazine* and has published widely in a number of magazines devoted to debating. In 1945, H. W. Wilson Company published his book, *Competitive Debate: Rules and Strategy*.

CARL E. BURKLUND: *Hyacinths and Biscuits* (Ph. D., Michigan) is Professor of English in the College of Engineering at the University of Michigan. Besides being a teacher, Mr. Burkland has been both an editor and a creative writer. He is editor of the anthology, *New Michigan Verse* (1940), and is co-editor of *Patterns and Perspectives: Essays for College Use* (1942). He has published over a hundred poems in a score of magazines, including *Poetry*, the *Sewanee Review*, the *Golden Book*, and the *Virginia Quarterly Review*. Mr. Burklund has just completed a manuscript for a book on the nature of poetry.

HERSCHEL L. BRICKER: *Theatre at Shrivenham* (A. B., Coe) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Maine and Director of the Maine Masque Theatre. During most of 1945, he was head of the Theatre Branch at the Army's Shrivenham American University. The next year he lectured widely to G. I. audiences in Europe, delivered an address at the Shakespeare Festival at Stratford-upon-Avon, functioned as theatre consultant for the Air Forces Theatre Workshop at Wiesbaden, Germany, and directed the Army Day show, "Yan-

kee Jubilee," at Vienna. In 1936, Mr. Bricker published *Our Theatre Today*. He is a past president of the American Educational Theatre Association.

BARNARD HEWITT: *Some Uses of the "Frame" in Playwriting* (A. B., A. M., Ph. D., Cornell) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of the Theatre, Brooklyn College. Formerly an Assistant Professor of English and Director of Dramatics at Montana State University, he returned to Montana last summer as guest theatre director and visiting professor. He has written articles for a number of magazines and journals and has published two books: *Art and Craft of Play Production*, and *One-act Plays*. Some readers will remember Mr. Hewitt as a former editor of the New Books section of the JOURNAL; at present he is an associate editor of the JOURNAL and is editor of the *American Educational Theatre Association News*.

JEANETTE ANDERSON: *Is There a Word for Aphasics?* (A. B., Rockford College; A. M., Ph. D., Wisconsin) was formerly Associate Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech Clinic, Louisiana State University. She has written on aphasia for the *Journal of Speech Disorders*, and on semantics for the JOURNAL. She writes that she is carrying on further research and clinical experimentation with therapeutic techniques for use with aphasics. Miss Anderson is also an associate editor of the JOURNAL.

JOHN C. SNIDECOR: *Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers* (A. B., California; A. M., Ph. D., Iowa) is Associate Professor of Speech and Head of the Division of Speech, University of California, Santa Barbara College. Until recently Mr. Snidecor was Officer in Charge of the Curriculum Section, Naval Training, Bureau of Naval Personnel. LOUIS A. MALLORY (A. B., A. M., Ph. D., Wisconsin) has concluded his research work in naval communications and has resumed his position as Assistant Professor of Speech, Brooklyn College. He has written for the QUARTERLY JOURNAL and for *The Foundations of Speech* (ed., J. M. O'Neill) and for the *History and Criticism of American Public Address*.

HEROLD LILLYWHITE: *Speech Needs of Teachers* (B. S., Utah State Agricultural College; A. M., Minnesota; Ph. D., New York University) is Associate Professor of Speech at the College of the Pacific and Stockton Junior College. He has had wide experience as a teacher of speech—at the State Teachers College at Moorhead, Minnesota, the University of Idaho, the University of Minnesota, New York University, and public schools in Idaho and Arizona. His article on the evolution of the director in the American theatre appeared in the JOURNAL for February, 1941.

D. P. MCKELVEY: *Improving the Fundamentals Course* (A. B., California; A. M., Southern California; Ph. D., Wisconsin) is Associate Professor of Speech and Drama at Stanford University. He is now serving also as Coordinator of the Basic Courses at Stanford. His articles have appeared in *Speech Monographs* and in the JOURNAL.

WESLEY WIKSELL: *The Problem of Listening* (A. B., A. M., Iowa; Ph. D., Louisiana State) is Chairman of the Communications Division, Stephens College. He is collaborating on a book, *Understanding and Using Ideas*, to be published soon by Harpers.

ARGUS TRESIDDER: *Public Speaking in the Seagram Plan* (A. B., A. M., Ph. D., Cornell) is consultant in communication with the Joseph E. Seagram and Sons Company. He has been on the faculties of the University of Kansas, University of Tennessee, Cornell University, The College of the City of New York, and Madison College. As a naval officer during the war, he was stationed at the University of Louisville. He is author of *Reading to Others*, a co-author of *Writing and Speaking*, and a contributor to the revised edition of *Principles of Effective Speaking*. He has written widely for various educational journals and contributed to *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of A. M. Drummond*.

REESE D. JAMES: *Public Speaking as a Journalism Course* (A. B., A. M., Ph. D., Pennsylvania) is Associate Professor of English and director of courses in journalism at the University of Pennsylvania. As his article bears witness, he has long been aware that training in public speaking complements training in journalism. Mr. James has published a volume on the history of the Philadelphia stage, has written a number of short stories, and has turned out five detective novels. His last contribution to the JOURNAL dealt with the style of radio speaking.

INDEX VOLUME XXXII

Abbott, Wilbur Cortez: *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, III, The Protectorate, 1653-1655. Rev. by Wilbur E. Gilman, 523.

Addenda to *Coleridge the Talker*. Richard W. Armour and Raymond F. Howes, 298.

Adix, La Vern (Rev.) *Planning and Equipping the Educational Theatre* (A. S. Gillette), [illegible].

Allen, Harold B. *The American Language*: Supplement One (Rev.) (H. L. Mencken), 114.

Alv, Bower *Seargeant S. Prentiss: Whig Orator of the Old South* (Dallas C. Dickey), 253.

Man and His Works (Edward Lee Thorndike), 529.

Ideas in America (Howard Mumford Jones), 535.

Anderson, Harold H. and Helen M. Brewer: *Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalties*. Rev. by Robert J. Sailstad, 264.

Anderson, Jeanette O.: Is There a Word for Aphasics?, 485.

Appraisal of High-School Speech, An. Irene E. Mehlhouse, 78.

Are We Isolationists? Thomas E. Coulton, 425.

Armour, Richard W. and Raymond F. Howes: Addenda to *Coleridge the Talker*, 298.

Auer, J. Jeffery: Discussion Programs and Techniques in the Armed Forces, 303.

Baird, A. Craig (Rev.) *Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America* (Charles R. Morris, Ed.), 115

Representative American Speeches: 1944-1945 Rev. by Kenneth G. Hance, 118.

Baird, A. Craig, Ed.

Barnard, Raymond H. (Rev.) *Selected Speeches and Statements of General of the Army George C. Marshall* (Major H. A. De Weerd, Ed.), 259.

Barzun, Jacques: *Teacher in America*. Rev. by Conrad W. Freed, 260.

Bavely, Ernest: Dramatic Arts in Secondary Education, 40.

Becker, Bernard: The Synthesis of Sound, 61.

Bernard Lami's *L"Art de Parler:* A Critical Analysis. Douglas Ehninger, 429.

Berry, Mildred Freburg: The Modern Teacher of Speech Is Obsolete, 143.

A Liberal Education for the Teachers of Speech, 187.

Mentor Graham, The Man Who Taught Lincoln (Rev.) (Kundigunde Duncan and D. F. Nichols), 524.

Citizen Toussaint (Ralph Nickols), 524.

Blank, Earl W.: Integrating Dramatic Activities at Berea College, 318.

Bolinger, Dwight L.: The Intonation of Quoted Questions, 197.

Borchers, Gladys L.: An Experiment in High-School Speech Teaching, 373.

Borchers, Gladys L. and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *Speech*. Rev. by Howard Gilkinson, [illegible].

Brewer, Helen M. and Harold H. Anderson: *Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalties*. Rev. by Robert J. Sailstad, 264.

Brigham, Herschel L.: Theatre at Shrivenham, [illegible].

Brigham, Donald M. (Rev.) *How to Improve Your Preaching* (Bob Jones, Jr.), 526.

Brigance, William Norwood and Florence Hamilton: *A Drill Manual for Improving Speech*. Rev. by Katherine F. Thorn, 122.

Brooks, Donald C. (Rev.) *Educating Liberally* (Joyt H. Hudson), 116.

Bibliography Study and the Scholarly Profession (Hardin Craig), 399.

Bryson, Lyman: *The New Prometheus*. Rev. by Elwood Murray, 537.

Bunch, C. C.: *Clinical Audiometry*. Rev. by Harold Westlake, 399.

Burklund, Carl E.: Hyacinths and Biscuits — On a Rationale for the Oral Reading of Poetry, 469.

Butler, Jessie Haver: Public Speaking in Public Life.

Callahan, Florence: The Practice Teacher of Speech in the Secondary School, 228.

Case Method in Argumentation, The. James Gordon Emerson, III, 1.

Chapman, Myfanwy, Berneice Rutherford, and Lillian Read: Digest of Study of Speech Correction in Cities of 100,000 and Over, 207.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Theory And Practice of Preaching. Theodore F. Nelson, 173.

Children's Theatre: An Adventure for High School and College. Virginia Lee Comer, 331.

Clark, Ruth Millburn: Group Application of the Thematic Apperception Test, 343.

Clarke, R. Milton and Arthur C. Hicks: *A Stage Version of Shelley's Cenci*. Rev. by C. Lowell Lees, 121.

Clinician's Story, A. Mayme V. Smith, 63.

Comer, Virginia Lee: Children's Theatre: An Adventure for High School and College, 331.

Committee on Teacher Education: Speech in Teacher Education, 80.

COMMUNICATION

COMMUNICATION (see also SPEECH IN THE ARMED FORCES)

A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course. Wilson B. Paul, Frederick Sorensen, and Elwood Murray, 232.

Speech and Effective Communication: Re-examination of Basic Assumptions. Cyril F. Hager, 26.

Conference Discussion at Shrivenham. Halbert E. Gulley, 316.

Coulton, Thomas E.: Are We Isolationists?, 425.

Crafton, Allen and Jessica Rover: *The Complete Acted Play*. Rev. by Valentine Windt, 258.

Craig, Hardin: *Literary Study and the Scholarly Profession*. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant, 399.

Cunningham, Cornelius Carman: The Rhythm of Robinson Jeffers' Poetry as Revealed by Oral Reading, 351.

Davis, Eugene C.: *Amateur Theatre Handbook* Rev. by John Erb Dietrich, 523.

DEBATE

Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and John Keltner, 385.

The Double-Summary Technique in Debate. G. M. Musgrave, 158.

Densmore, G. E.: The Teaching of Speech Delivery, 67. (Rev.) *The Role of Speech in the Secondary School*, 395.

De Weerd, Major H. A., Ed.: *Selected Speeches and Statements of General of the Army George C. Marshall*. Rev. by Raymond H. Barnard, 259.

Diary of a Problem Child. Marion Parsons Robinson, 357.

Dickey, Dallas C.: Were They Ephemeral and Florid? 16.

Dickey, Dallas C.: *Seargeant S. Prentiss: Whig Orator of the Old South*. Rev. by Bower Aly, 253.

Dietrich, John Erb (Rev.) *Amateur Theatre Handbook* (Eugene C. Davis), 523.

Digest of Study of Speech Correctionists in Cities of 100,000 and over. Berneice Rutherford, Lillian Read, and Myfanwy Chapman, 287.
DISCUSSION
Addenda to *Coleridge the Talker*. Richard W. Armour and Raymond F. Howes, 298.
Conference Discussion at Shrivenham. Halbert E. Gulley, 316.
Discussion Programs and Techniques in the Armed Forces. J. Jeffery Auer, 303.
Public Discussion in Japan—Index to Democracy. Charles W. Lomas, 311.
Speech and Human Relations in Industry. Charles T. Estes, 160.
Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and John Keltner, 385.
The Iowa University Student Senate. Robert F. Ray, 454.
Dolman, Jr., John (Rev.) *The Use of Drama* (Hartley Granville-Barker), 396.
Double-Summary Technique in Debate, The. G. M. Musgrave, 458.
DRAMA AND THE THEATRE (see also DRAMATICS)
Children's Theatre: An Adventure for High School and College. Virginia Lee Comer, 331.
Julius Bab's First Critique of the Theatre. Lisa Rauschenbusch, I, 33, II, 323.
"One World" In Acting. Ilia Motyleff, 209.
Theatre at Shrivenham. Herschel L. Bricker, 475.
Some Uses of the "Frame" in Playwriting. Barnard Hewitt, 480.
DRAMATICS (see also DRAMA AND THE THEATRE)
Children's Theatre: An Adventure for High School and College. Virginia Lee Comer, 331.
Dramatics Arts in Secondary Education. Ernest Bavely, 40.
Integrating Dramatic Activities at Berea College. Earl W. Blank, 318.
Theatre at Shrivenham. Herschel L. Bricker, 475.
Dramatic Arts in Secondary Education. Ernest Bavely, 40.
Duncan, Kundigunde and D. F. Nickols: *Mentor Graham, The Man Who Taught Lincoln*. Rev. by Mildred Frebury Berry, 524.
Duncan, Melba Hurd: Localizing Individual Problems in Oral Interpretation, 213.
Duncan, Melba Hurd (Rev.) *The Psychological Frontiers of Society* (Abram Kardiner with the collaboration of Ralph Linton, Cora Du Bois and James West), 528.
Freudianism and the Literary Mind (Frederick J. Hoffman), 534.

Eddy, Captain William C.: *Television: The Eyes of Tomorrow*. Rev. by John L. Hamilton, 527.
Ehninger, Douglas: Bernard Lami's *L'Art de Parler*: A Critical Analysis, 429.
Ehrsam, Theodore G. (Rev.) *College Handbook of Composition* (Edwin C. Woolley and Franklin W. Scott with the collaboration of Evelyn Tripp) 122.
EIDH, In Late Tudor and Early Stuart Public Discussion, The "Special Topic." George P. Rice, Jr., 21.
Emerson, James Gordon: The Case Method in Argumentation, III, 1.
Estes, Charles T.: Speech and Human Relations in Industry, 160.
Experiment in High-School Speech Teaching, An. Gladys L. Borchers, 373.
Explosives in Speech. James Murray, 203.

Farma, William J. (Rev.) Speech Quality and Interpretation (Jane Herendeen), 522.
Fesler, Frances Welborn: National Survey of State Legislative Provisions for the Speech Defective Child in the Public School, 2[illegible]
Fessenden, Seth A.: *Speech and the Teacher*. Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes, 397.
Field and Shipboard Training of Battle Telephone Talkers. Louis A. Mallory and John C. Snidecor, 490.
Flesch, Rudolf: *The Art of Plain Talk*. Rev. by Franklin H. Knower, 530.
Footnote On Phonetics and Standards of Pronunciation, A. Letitia Raubicheck, 51.
Fort, Lyman M.: *Speech for All*. Rev. by Howard W. Townsend, 396.
FORUM
Constitution and By-Laws of the Speech Association of America, 249.
Convention Headquarters for 1946, 245.
Minutes of the Finance Committee, 393.
Report of the Nominating Committee, 247.
Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Conference, 245.
Report of Registrations, Reconversion Conference, Columbus, 1945, 252.
To Phoneticians. Bert Emsley, 391.
To the Editor. John Dolman, Jr., 391.
Freed, Conrad W. (Rev.) Teacher in America (Jacques Barzun), 260.
Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course, A. Wilson B. Paul, Frederick Sorensen, and Elwood Murray, 232.

Gann, Edith: *Reading Difficulties and Personality Difficulties*. Rev. by Ernst Henrikson, 524.
Gilkinson, Howard (Rev.) *Speech* (Andrew Thomas Weaver and Gladys Louise Borchers), 400.
Gillette, A. S.: *Planning and Equipping the Educational Theatre*. Rev. by La Verne Adix, 119.
Gilman, Wilbur E. (Rev.) *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, III, The Protectorate, 1653-1655 (Wilbur Cortez Abbott), 523.
Glatstein, Irwin Lee: Semantics, Too, Has a Past, 48.
Goldberg, Maxwell, H.: On Rereading *Language in Action*, 184.
Granville-Barker, Hartley: *The Use of Drama*. Rev. by John Dolman Jr., 396.
Gray, Giles Wilkeson (Rev.) *Your Voice: Applied Science of Vocal Art, Singing and Speaking* (Douglas Stanley), 257.
Gray, Giles Wilkeson: The "Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep," 446.
Greene, Jay B. and Roland Ketchum: *Improving Your Vocabulary and Spelling*. Rev. by Ralph C. Leyden, 120.
Group Application of the Thematic Apperception Test. Ruth Millburn Clark, 343.
Gulley, Halbert E.: Conference Discussion at Shrivenham, 316.

Hadley, J. M., Lieutenant, USNR and Lieutenant Commander M. D. Steer, USNR: The Speech Intelligibility Program in Naval Aviation: Historical Summary, 217.
Hager, Cyril F.: Speech and Effective Communication: Re-Examination of Basic Assumptions.
Hallonquist, Tore and John Gray Peatman: *The Patterning of Listener Attitudes toward Radio Broadcasts*. Rev. by William M. Timmons, 264.

Hamilton, John L. (Rev.) *Television: The Eyes of Tomorrow* (Captain William C. Eddy), 527
The Hays Office (Raymond Moley), 532.
Economic Control of the Motion Picture Industry (Mae D. Huettig), 532.
Hance, Kenneth G. (Rev.) *Representative American Speeches: 1944-1945* (Sel. by A. Craig Baird) 118.
Harry Bainbridge Gough. Herold T. Ross, 193.
Hedgecock, Leroy D. (Rev.) *Lip Reading for Adult Beginners* (Harriet Montague), 526.
Henderson, Florence M. and William Norwood Brigance: *A Drill Manual for Improving Speech* Rev. by Katherine F. Thorn, 122.
Henrikson, Ernest (Rev.) *Reading Difficulties and Personality Difficulties* (Edith Gann), 524.
Herendeen, Jane: *Speech Quality and Interpretation.* Rev. by William J. Farma, 522.
Hewitt, Barnard: Some Uses of the "Frame" in Playwriting, 480.
Hicks, Arthur C. and R. Milton Clarke: *A Stage Version of Shelley's Cenci.* Rev. by C. Lowell Lees, 121.
HISTORY OF RHETORIC (see also OLD BOOKS)
Bernard Lami's *L'Art de Parler*: A Critical Analysis. Douglas Ehninger, 429.
Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Theory and Practice of Preaching. Theodore F. Nelson, 173.
Diary of a Problem Child. Marion Parsons Robinson, 357.
The "Special Topic, EIDH, in Late Tudor and Early Stuart Public Discussion. George P. Rice, Jr., 21.
The "Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep." Giles Wilkeson Gray, 446.
Hoffman, Frederick J.: *Freudianism and the Literary Mind.* Rev. by Melba Hurd Duncan, 534.
Holmes, F. Lincoln D. (Rev.) *Speech and The Teacher* (Seth A. Fessenden), 397.
HONOR ROLL, 516.
How A Member of Congress Measures The Response of His Constituents. John M. Vorys, 170.
Howes, Raymond F. and Richard W. Armour: Addenda to *Coleridge the Talker*, 298.
Hubbell, Richard: *Television: Programming and Production.* Rev. by E. William Ziebarth, 117.
Hudson, Hoyt H.: *Educating Liberally.* Rev. by Donald C. Bryant, 116.
Huettig, Mae D.: *Economic Control of the Motion Picture Industry.* Rev. by John L. Hamilton, 532.
Hyacinths and Biscuits—On a Rationale for the Oral Reading of Poetry. Carl E. Burklund, 469.

Implementing the Radio Course. Harold Weiss, 335.
Improving the Fundamentals Course. D. P. McKelvey, 501.
Index to Articles Published in The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Volumes I-XXX; And In Speech Monographs, Volumes I-XL. Franklin H. Knower, 102.
Integrating Dramatic Activities at Berea College. Earl W. Blank, 318.
INTERPRETATION
Diary of a Problem Child. Marion Parsons Robinson, 357.
Hyacinths and Biscuits—On a Rationale for the Oral Reading of Poetry. Carl E. Burklund, 469.
Localizing Individual Problems in Oral Interpretation. Melba Hurd Duncan, 213.
The Rhythm of Robinson Jeffers' Poetry as Revealed by Oral Reading. Cornelius Carman Cunningham, 351.
Intonation of Quoted Questions, The. Dwight L. Bolinger, 197.
Iowa University Student Senate, The. Robert F. Ray, 454.
Is There a Word for Aphasics? Jeanette O. Anderson, 485.

James, Reese, D.: Public Speaking as a Journalism Course, 511.
John Quincy Adams: Speaker and Rhetorician. Horace G. Rahskopf, 435.
Jones, Bob, Jr.: *How to Improve Your Preaching.* Rev. by Donald M. Brieland, 526.
Jones, Howard Mumford: *Ideas in America.* Rev. by Bower Aly, 535.
Julius Bab's First Critique of the Theatre. Lisa Rauschenbusch, I, 33; II, 323.

Kardiner, Abram with the collaboration of Ralph Linton, Cora Du Bois, and James West: *The Psychological Frontiers of Society.* Rev. by Melba Hurd Duncan, 528.
Keltner, John and Karl F. Robinson: Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools, 385.
Ketchum, Roland and Jay B. Greene: *Improving Your Vocabulary and Spelling.* Rev. by Ralph C. Leyden, 120.
Knower, Franklin, H.: Index to Articles Published in The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Volumes I-XXX; and in Speech Monographs, Volumes I-XL, 102.
Knower, Franklin H. (Rev.) *General Education in a Free Society*, 261.
The Art of Plain Talk (Rudolph Flesch), 530.
Korngold, Ralph: *Citizen Toussaint.* Rev. by Mildred F. Berry, 531.

Lange, Paulus: Pronunciation and the Dictionaries, 190.
LANGUAGE
Is There a Word for Aphasics? Jeanette O. Anderson, 485.
Linguistic Problems of Deafened Veterans Returning to the Universities. Alice Mendenhall Welsh, 340.
On Rereading *Language in Action.* Maxwell H. Goldberg, 184.
Pronunciation and the Dictionaries. Paulus Lange, 190.
Semantics, Too, Has a Past. Irwin Lee Glatstein, 48.
The Rhythm of Robinson Jeffers' Poetry as Revealed by Oral Reading. Cornelius Carman Cunningham, 351.
Lawton, Sherman P. (Rev.) *Radio Research, 1942-43* (Paul F. Lazarfield and Frank Stanton, Ed.), 398.
Lazarfield, Paul F. and Frank Stanton, Ed.: *Radio Research, 1492-43.* Rev. by Sherman P. Lawton, 398.
Lees, C. Lowell (Rev.) *A Stage Version of Shelley's Cenci* (Arthur C. Hicks and R. Milton Clarke), 121.
Lent, Henry B.: *"This is Your Announcer—".* Rev. by Madeline S. Long, 528.
Leyden, Ralph C. (Rev.) *Improving Your Vocabulary and Spelling* (Roland Ketchum and Jay B. Greene), 120.
Liberal Education for the Teacher of Speech, A. Mildred Freburg Berry, 287.
Lillywhite, Herold: Speech Needs of Teachers, 496.

Linguistic Problems of Deafened Veterans Returning to the Universities. Alice Mendenhall Welsh, 340.
Localizing Individual Problems in Oral Interpretation. Melba Hurd Duncan, 213.
Lomas, Charles W.: Public Discussion in Japan —Index to Democracy, 311.
Long, Madeline S. (Rev.) *"This is Your Announcer—"* (Henry B. Lent), 528.
Luthin, Reinhart H.: *The First Lincoln Campaign*. Rev. by Earl W. Wiley, 532.

Mallory, Louis A. and John C. Snidecor: The Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers, 367.
Field and Shipboard Training of Battle Telephone Talkers, 490.
Marckwardt, Albert H. (Rev.) *Essentials of English for Latin Americans* (Dominic P. Rotunda, Willard M. Smith, and Evaline Uhl Wright), 262.
McKelvey, D. P.: Improving the Fundamentals Course, 501.
Mehlhouse, Irene E.: An Appraisal of High-School Speech, 78.
Mencken, H. L.: *The American Language: Supplement One*. Rev. by Harold B. Allen, 114.
Miller, Edd: Speech Introductions and Conclusions, 181.
Mississippi's Great White Chief: James K. Vardaman. Eugene E. White, 442.
Modern Teacher of Speech Is Obsolete, The. Mildred Freburg Berry, 143.
Moley, Raymond: *The Hays Office*. Rev. by John L. Hamilton, 532.
Monroe, Alan H.: *Principles of Speech, Brief Edition*. Rev. by C. Horton Talley, 121.
Montague, Harriet: *Lip Reading for Adult Beginners*. Rev. by Leroy D. Hedgecock, 526.
Morford, Cyretta: Why Not Begin at the Beginning? 55.
Morris, Charles R. (Ed.): *Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America*. Rev. by A. Craig Baird, 114.
Mott, Frank L.: *Jefferson and the Press*. Rev. by Lester Thonssen, 263.
Motyleff, Ilia: "One World" in Acting, 209.
Murray, Elwood, Wilson B. Paul, and Frederick Sorensen: A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course, 232.
Murray, Elwood (Rev.) *The New Prometheus* (Lyman Bryson), 537.
Murray, James: Explosives in Speech? 203.
Musgrave, G. M.: The Double-Summary Technique in Debate, 458.

National Survey of State Legislative Provisions for the Speech Defective Child in the Public School. Frances Welborn Fesler, 349.
Nelson, Theodore F.: Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Theory and Practice of Preaching, 173.
New Books
Amateur Theatre Handbook (Eugene C. Davis). Rev. by John Erb Dietrich, 523.
American Language: Supplement One, The (H. L. Mencken). Rev. by Harold B. Allen, 114.
Art of Plain Talk, The (Rudolf Flesch). Rev. by Franklin H. Knower, 530.
Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America (Ed. by Charles R. Morris). Rev. by A. Craig Baird, 115.
Citizen Toussaint (Ralph Korngold). Rev. by Mildred F. Berry, 531.
Clinical Audiometry (C. C. Bunch). Rev. by Harold Westlake, 399.
College Handbook of Composition (Edwin Woolley and Franklin W. Scott with collaboration of Evelyn Tripp). Rev. Theodore G. Ehrsam, 122.
Complete Acted Play, The (Allen Craf and Jessica Royer). Rev. by Valen Windt, 258.
Drill Manual for Improving Speech, A (W liam Norwood Brigance and Florence Henderson). Rev. Katherine F. Thorn.
Economic Control of the Motion Picture dustry (Mae D. Huettig). Rev. by John Hamilton, 532.
Educating Liberally (Hoyt H. Hudson). R by Donald C. Bryant, 116.
English Language in American Educat The (Thomas Clark Pollock with the operation of William Clyde de Vane and Robert E. Spiller). Rev. by James O'Neill, 254.
Essentials of English for Latin Americ (Dominic P. Rotunda, Willard M. Smit Evaline Uhl Wright). Rev. by Albert H Marckwardt, 262.
First Lincoln Campaign, The (Reinhart H Luthin). Rev. by Earl W. Wiley, 532.
Freudianism and the Literary Mind (Freder ick J. Hoffman). Rev. by Melba Hurd Duncan, 534.
General Education in a Free Society. Rev. b Franklin H. Knower, 261.
Hays Office, The (Raymond Moley). Rev. b John L. Hamilton, 532.
"Hiawatha" with Its Original Indian Legend (Chase S. Osborn and Stellanova Osborn) Rev. by Frank M. Rarig, 536.
How to Improve Your Preaching (Bob Jones Jr.). Rev. by Donald M. Brieland, 526.
Ideas in America (Howard Mumford Jones) Rev. by Bower Aly, 535.
Improving Your Vocabulary and Spelling (Roland Ketchum and Jay B. Greene). Rev by Ralph C. Leyden, 120.
Jefferson and the Press (Frank L. Mott) Rev by Lester Thonssen, 263.
Lip Reading for Adult Beginners (Harriet Montague). Rev. by Leroy D. Hedgecock 526.
Literary Study and the Scholarly Profession (Hardin Craig). Rev. by Donald C. Bryant 399.
Man and His Works (Edward Lee Thorndike). Rev. by Bower Aly, 529.
Mentor Graham, The Man Who Taught Lincoln (Kundigunde Duncan and D. F Nickols). Rev. by Mildred Freburg Berry 524.
New Prometheus, The (Lyman Bryson). Rev by Elwood Murray, 537.
Patterning of Listener Attitudes toward Radio Broadcasts, The (John Gray Peatman and Tore Hallonquist). Rev. b William M. Timmons, 264.
Planning and Equipping the Educational Theatre (A. S. Gillette). Rev. by La Verne Adix, 119.
Principles of Speech, Brief Edition (Alan H Monroe) Rev. by C. Horton Talley, 121.
Psychological Frontiers of Society, The (Abram Kardiner with the collaboration of Ralph Linton, Cora Du Bois, and James West). Rev. by Melba Hurd Duncan, 528
Radio Research, 1942-43 (Paul F. Lazarfeld and Frank Stanton, Ed.). Rev. by Sherman P. Lawton, 398.
Reading Difficulties and Personality Organization (Edith Gann). Rev. by Ernest Henrikson, 524.

Representative American Speeches: 1944-1945. (Sel. by A. Craig Baird). Rev. by Kenneth G. Hance, 118.
Role of Speech in the Secondary School, The. Rev. by G. E. Densmore, 395.
Sargent S. Prentiss: Whig Orator of the Old South (Dallas C. Dickey). Rev. by Bower Aly, 253.
Selected Speeches and Statements of General of the Army George C. Marshall (Major H. A. De Weerd, Ed.). Rev. by Raymond H. Barnard, 259.
Speech (Andrew Thomas Weaver and Gladys Louise Borchers). Rev. by Howard Gilkinson, 400.
Speech and the Teacher (Seth A. Fessenden). Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes, 397.
Speech for All (Lyman M. Fort). Rev. by Howard W. Townsend, 396.
Speech Quality and Interpretation (Jane Herendeen). Rev. by William J. Farma, 522.
Stage Version of Shelley's Cenci, A (Arthur C. Hicks and R. Milton Clarke). Rev. by C. Lowell Lees, 121.
Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities. (Harold H. Anderson and Helen M. Brewer) Rev. by Robert J. Sailstad, 264.
Teacher in America (Jacques Barzun). Rev. by Conrad W. Freed, 260.
Television: Programming and Production (Richard Hubbell). Rev. by E. William Ziebarth, 117.
Television: The Eyes of Tomorrow (Captain William C. Eddy). Rev. by John L. Hamilton, 527.
"This is Your Announcer—" (Henry B. Lent). Rev. by Madeline S. Long, 528.
Use of Drama, The (Hartley Granville-Barker). Rev. by John Dolman, Jr., 396.
Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, The, III, The Protectorate, 1653-1655 (Wilbur Cortez Abbott). Rev. by Wilbur E. Gilman, 523.
Your Voice: Applied Science of Vocal Art, Singing and Speaking (Douglas Stanley). Rev. by Giles Wilkeson Gray, 257.
Nichols, Alan: Ray Keeslar Immel, 31.
Nickols, D. F. and Kundigunde Duncan: *Mentor Graham, The Man Who Taught Lincoln.* Rev. by Mildred Freburg Berry, 524.

Old Books
The American First Class Book. John Pierpont. Rev. by L. T., 125.
The Arte of Reason, righly termed, Witcraft, teaching a perfect way to argue and dispute. Made by Ralphe Lever. Rev. by Ross Scanlan, 123.
The Readers Guide, John Hall. Rev. by L. T. 124.
O'Neill, James M. (Rev.) *The English Language in American Education* (Thomas Clark Pollock with the cooperation of William Clyde de Vane and Robert E. Spiller), 254.
"One World" in Acting. Ilia Motyleff, 209.
On Rereading *Language in Action.* Maxwell H. Goldberg, 184.
Oratory of William Edgar Borah, The. Albert E. Whitehead, 292.
Osborn, Chase S. and Stellanova Osborn: *"Hiawatha" with Its Original Indian Legends.* Rev. by Frank M. Rarig, 536.

Paul, Wilson B., Frederick Sorensen, and Elwood Murray: A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course, 232.
Peatman, John Gray and Tore Hallonquist: *The Patterning of Listener Attitudes toward Radio Broadcast.* Rev. by William M. Timmons, 264.
Phonetics
A Footnote on Phonetics and Standards of Pronunciation. Letitia Raubicheck, 51.
Pronunciation and the Dictionaries. Paulus Lange, 190.
Pollock, Thomas Clark with the cooperation of William Clyde de Vane and Robert E. Spiller: *The English Language in American Education.* Rev. by James M. O'Neill, 254.
Practice Teacher of Speech in the Secondary School, The. Florence Callahan, 228.
Preaching
Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Theory and Practice of Preaching. Theodore F. Nelson, 173.
"Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep," The. Giles Wilkeson Gray, 446.
Problem of Listening, The. Wesley Wiksell, 505.
Pronunciation (see also Phonetics)
A Footnote on Phonetics and Standards of Pronunciation. Letitia Raubicheck, 51.
Field and Shipboard Training of Battle Telephone Talkers. Louis A. Mallory and John C. Snidecor, 490.
Pronunciation and the Dictionaries. Paulus Lange, 190.
The Intonation of Quoted Questions. Dwight L. Bolinger, 197.
The Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers. John C. Snidecor and Louis A. Mallory, 367.
The Speech Intelligibility Program in Naval Aviation: Historical Summary. Lieutenant Commander M. D. Steer, USNR, and Lieutenant J. M. Hadley, USNR, 217.
Pronunciation and the Dictionaries. Paulus Lange, 190
Public Address
Addenda to *Coleridge the Talker.* Richard W. Armour and Raymond F. Howes, 298.
Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Theory and Practice of Preaching. Theodore F. Nelson, 173.
How a Member of Congress Measures the Response of His Constituents. John M. Vorys, 170.
John Quincy Adams: Speaker and Rhetorician. Horace G. Rahskopf, 435.
Mississippi's Great White Chief: James K. Vardaman. Eugene E. White, 442.
Public Speaking in Public Life. Jessie Haver Butler, 12.
The Oratory of William Edgar Borah. Albert E. Whitehead, 292.
Were They Ephemeral and Florid? Dallas C. Dickey, 16.
Public Discussion in Japan—Index to Democracy. Charles W. Lomas, 311.
Public Speaking as a Journalism Course. Reese D. James, 511.
Public Speaking in Public Life. Jessie Haver Butler, 12.
Public Speaking in the Seagram Plan. Argus Tresidder, 509.

Radio
Implementing the Radio Course. Harold Weiss, 335.
The Synthesis of Sound. Bernard Becker, 61.
Why Not Begin at the Beginning? Cyretta Morford, 55.
Rahskopf, Horace G.: John Quincy Adams: Speaker and Rhetorician, 435.

Rarig, Frank M. (Rev.) *"Hiawatha" with Its Original Indian Legends* (Chase S. Osborn and Stellanova Osborn), 536.
Raubicheck, Lititia: A Footnote On Phonetics and Standards of Pronunciation, 51.
Rauschenbusch, Lisa: Julias Bab's First Critique of the Theatre, I, 33; II, 323.
Ray Keeslar Immel. Alan Nichols, 31.
Ray, Robert F.: The Iowa University Student Senate, 454.
Read, Lillian, Berneice Rutherford, and Myfanwy Chapman: Digest of Study of Speech Correction in Cities of 100,000 and Over, 207.
RHETORIC (see HISTORY OF RHETORIC, THEORY OF RHETORIC, and PUBLIC ADDRESS)
Rhythm of Robinson Jeffers' Poetry as Revealed by Oral Reading, The. Cornelius Carman Cunningham, 351.
Rice, George P., Jr.: The "Special Topic," EIDH, In Late Tudor and Early Stuart Public Discussion, 21.
Robinson, Karl F. and Waunita Taylor Shaw: Some Suggested Units in Acting and Stage Make-Up For Use in Secondary Schools, 71. And John Keltner: Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools, 385.
Robinson, Marion Parsons: Diary of a Problem Child, 357.
Ross, Herold T.: Harry Bainbridge Gough, 193.
Rotunda, Dominic P., Willard M. Smith, and Evaline Uhl Wright: *Essentials of English for Latin Americans*. Rev. by Albert Marckwardt, 262.
Rover, Jessica and Allen Crafton: *The Complete Acted Play*. Rev. by Valentine Windt, 258.
Rutherford, Berneice, Lillian Read, and Myfanwy Chapman: Digest of Study of Speech Correction in Cities of 100,000 and Over, 207.

Sailstad, Robert J. (Rev.) *Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalties* (Harold H. Anderson and Helen M. Brewer), 264.
Scott, Franklin W. and Edwin C. Woolley with the collaboration of Evelyn Tripp: *College Handbook of Composition*. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 122.
Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers, The. John C. Snidecor and Louis A. Mallory, 367.
SEMANTICS
A Funcional Core for the Basic Communications Course. Wilson B. Paul, Frederick Sorensen, and Elwood Murray, 232.
On Rereading *Language in Action*. Maxwell H. Goldberg, 184.
Semantics, Too, Has a Past. Irwin Lee Glatstein, 48.
Shaw, Waunita Taylor and Karl F. Robinson: Some Suggested Units In Acting and Stage Make-Up For Use in Secondary Schools, 71.
Smith, Mayme V.: A Clinician's Story, 63.
Smith, Willard M., Dominic P. Rotunda, and Evaline Uhl Wright: *Essentials of English for Latin Americans*. Rev. by Albert H. Marckwardt, 262.
Snidecor, John C. and Louis A. Mallory: The Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers, 367.
Field and Shipboard Training of Battle Telephone Talkers, 490.
Some Suggested Units in Acting and Stage Make-Up For Use in Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and Waunita Taylor Shaw, 71.
Speech Needs of Teachers. Herold Lillywhite 496.
Some Uses of the "Frame" in Playwriting. Barnard Hewitt, 480.
Sorensen, Frederick, Wilson B. Paul, and Elwood Murray: A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course, 232.
"Special Topic," The. EIDH, In Late Tudor and Early Stuart Public Discussion. George P. Rice, Jr., 21.
Speech and Effective Communication: A Examination of Basic Assumptions. Cyril F. Hager, 26.
Speech and Human Relations in Industry. Charles T. Estes, 160.
SPEECH CORRECTION
A Clinician's Story. Mayme V. Smith, 63.
An Appraisal of High-School Speech. Irene E. Mehlhouse, 78.
Digest of Study of Speech Correction in Cities of 100,000 and over. Berneice Rutherford, Lillian Read, and Myfanwy Chapman, 207.
Group Application of the Thematic Apperception Test. Ruth Millburn Clark, 318.
Is There a Word for Aphasics? Jeanette O. Anderson, 485.
Linguistic Problems of Deafened Veterans Returning to the Universities. Alice Mendenhall Welsh, 340.
National Survey of State Legislative Provisions for the Speech Defective Child in the Public School. Frances Welborn Fesler, 349.
SPEECH EDUCATION
A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course. Wilson B. Paul, Frederick Sorensen, and Elwood Murray, 232.
A Liberal Education for the Teacher of Speech. Mildred Freburg Berry, 287.
An Appraisal of High-School Speech. Irene E. Mehlhouse, 78.
An Experiment in High-School Speech Teaching. Gladys L. Borchers, 373.
Are We Isolationists? Thomas E. Coulton, 127.
A Speech Student's Experiment in College Education. Grace Walsh, 76.
Children's Theatre: An Adventure for High School and College. Virginia Lee Comer, 331.
Do We Neglect Voice Training? Arleigh B. Williamson, 145.
Dramatic Arts in Secondary Education. Ernest Bavely, 40.
Group Application of the Thematic Apperception Test. Ruth Millburn Clark, 318.
Implementing the Radio Course. Harold Weiss, 335.
Improving the Fundamentals Course. D. F. McKelvey, 501.
Integrating Dramatic Activities at Berea College. Earl W. Blank, 318.
Localizing Individual Problems in Oral Interpretation. Melba Hurd Duncan, 213.
National Survey of State Legislative Provisions for the Speech Defective Child in the Public School. Frances Welborn Fesler, 349.
Public Speaking as a Journalism Course. Reed D. James, 511.
Public Speaking in the Seagram Plan. Argus Tresidder, 509.
Speech and Effective Communication: A Examination of Basic Assumptions. Cyril F. Hager, 26.
Speech and Human Relations in Industry. Charles T. Estes, 160.
Speech Needs of Teachers. Herold Lillywhite 496.

Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and John Keltner, 385.
The Modern Teacher of Speech is Obsolete. Mildred Freburg Berry, 143.
The Practice Teacher of Speech in the Secondary School. Florence Callahan, 228.
The Problem of Listening. Wesley Wiksell, 505.
The Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers. John C. Snidecor and Louis A. Mallory, 367.
The Speech Intelligibility Program in Naval Aviation: Historical Summary. Lieutenant Commander M. D. Steer, USNR, and Lieutenant H. M. Hadley, USNR, 217.
The Teaching of Speech Delivery. G. E. Densmore, 67.
Units in Acting and Stage Make-up for Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and Waunita Taylor Shaw, 71.
Why Not Begin at the Beginning? Cyretta Morford, 55.
Speech in Teacher Education. Committee on Teacher Education, 80.
Speech Intelligibility Program in Naval Aviation: Historical Summary, The. Lieutentant Commander M. D. Steer, USNR and Lieutenant J. M. Hadley, USNR, 217.
Speech Introductions and Conclusions. Edd Miller, 181.
Speech Student's Experiment in College Education. A. Grace Walsh, 76.
Stanley, Douglas: *Your Voice: Applied Science of Vocal Art, Singing and Speaking*. Rev. by Giles Wilkeson Gray, 257.
Stanton, Frank and Paul F. Lazarfield, Ed.: *Radio Research, 1942-43*. Rev. by Sherman P. Lawton, 398.
Steer, M. D., Lieutenant Commander, USNR and Lieutenand J. M. Hadley, USNR: The Speech Intelligibility Program in Naval Aviation: Historical Summary, 217.
Speech in the Armed Services
Conference Discussion at Shrivenham. Halbert E. Gulley, 316.
Discussion Programs and Techniques in the Armed Forces. J. Jeffery Auer, 303.
Field and Shipboard Training of Battle Telephone Talkers. Louis A. Mallory and John C. Snidecor, 490.
The Selection and Training of Battle Telephone Talkers. John C. Snidecor and Louis A. Mallory, 367.
The Speech Intelligibility Program in Naval Aviation: Historical Summary. Lieutenant Commander M. D. Steer, USNR, and Lieutenant J. M. Hadley, USNR., 217.
Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and John Keltner, 385.
Symposium on Adequacy of Training of Voice Specialists. Arleigh B. Williamson, 145.
Synthesis of Sound, The. Bernard Becker, 61.

Talley, C. Horton (Rev.) *Principles of Speech*, Brief Edition (Alan H. Monroe), 121.
Teaching of Speech Delivery, The. G. E. Densmore, 67.
Theatre at Shrivenham. Herschel L. Bricker, 475.
Theatre (see Drama and Theatre)
Theory of Rhetoric
Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Theory and Practice of Preaching. Theodore F. Nelson, 173.
How A Member of Congress Measures the Response of his Constituents. John M. Vorys, 170.
John Quincy Adams: Speaker and Rhetorician. Horace G. Rahskopf, 435.
Speech and Effective Communication: Re-examination of Basic Assumptions. Cyril F. Hager, 26.
Speech Introductions and Conclusions. Edd Miller, 181.
The Case Method in Argumentation-III. James Gordon Emerson, 1.
The "Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep." Giles Wilkeson Gray, 446.
Were They Ephemeral and Florid? Dallas C. Dickey, 16.
Thonssen, Lester (Rev.) *Jefferson and the Press* Frank L. Mott, 263.
Thorn, Katherine F. (Rev.) *A Drill Manual For Improving Speech* (William Norwood Brigance and Florence M. Henderson), 122.
Thorndike, Edward Lee: *Man and His Works*. Rev. by Bower Aly, 529.
Timmons, William M. (Rev.) *The Patterning of Listener Attitudes toward Radio Broadcasts* (John Gray Peatman and Tore Hallonquist) 264.
Townsend, Howard W. (Rev.) *Speech for All* (Lyman M. Fort), 306.
Tresidder, Argus: Public Speaking in the Seagram Plan, 509.

Voice Science
Explosives in Speech. James Murray, 203.
The Intonation of Quoted Questions. Dwight L. Bolinger, 197.
Vorys, John M.: How A Member of Congress Measures the Response of His Constituents, 170.

Walsh, Grace: A Speech Student's Experiment In College Education, 76.
Weaver, Andrew Thomas and Gladys Louise Borchers: *Speech*. Rev. by Howard Gilkinson, 400.
Weiss, Harold: Implementing the Radio Course, 335.
Welsh, Alice Mendenhall: Linguistic Problems of Deafened Veterans Returning to Universities, 340.
Were They Ephemeral and Florid? Dallas C. Dickey, 16.
Westlake, Harold (Rev.) *Clinical Audiometry* (C. C. Bunch), 399.
White, Eugene E.: Mississippi's Great White Chief: James K. Vardaman, 442.
Whitehead, Albert E.: The Oratory of William Edgar Borah, 292.
Why Not Begin at the Beginning? Cyretta Morford, 55.
Wiksell, Wesley: The Problem of Listening, 505.
Wiley, Earl W. (Rev.) *The First Lincoln Campaign* (Reinhart H. Luthin), 532.
Williamson, Arleigh B.: Symposium on Adequacy of Training of Voice Specialists, 145.
Windt, Valentine (Rev.) *The Complete Acted Play* (Allen Crafton and Jessica Royer), 258.
Woolley, Edwin C. and Franklin W. Scott with the collaboration of Evelyn Tripp: *College Handbook of Composition*. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 122.
Wright, Evaline Uhl, Dominic P. Rotunda, and Willard M. Smith: *Essentials of English for Latin Americans*. Rev. by Albert H. Marckwardt, 262.

Ziebarth, E. William (Rev.) *Television: Programming and Production* (Richard Hubbell), 117.